

JPRS-UWE-86-004

19 March 1986

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 12, December 1985

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

19 March 1986

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 12, December 1985

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal **MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA** published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summary of Major Articles (pp 158-159).....	1
Editorial on Foreign Policy Aspects of New Party Program (pp 3-15).....	5
Arms Control, Bilateral Issues in Gorbachev Visit to France (pp 16-21) (V. Kravtsov).....	20
U.S. Pressure on UNESCO (pp 22-34) (G. Uranov) (not translated)	
Female Labor in the Developed Capitalist Countries (pp 35-43) (V. Lyubimova, Z. Pashetkina) (not translated)	
Developing Countries' Struggle Against Foreign Monopolies (pp 44-55) (O. Ulrikh) (not translated)	
Economic Crisis in South Africa (pp 56-66) (V. Shubin) (not translated)	
EXPERIENCE OF SOCIALIST INTEGRATION	
Transportation Development Within CEMA Described (pp 67-75) (B. Gorizontov).....	27
PLATFORM OF THE ECONOMIST AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS EXPERT	
Intracapitalist, East-West Technology Transfer Channels (pp 76-87) (B. Dobrovinskiy).....	40

CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES

- Problems of the Restructuring of the World Capitalist Economy (pp 88-98)
(V. Zarin) (not translated)

OUR COMMENTARY

- Declaration of Nuclear-Free Zone in South Pacific Applauded (pp 99-106)
(V. Amirov, Yu. Belokon)..... 54
- July 1985 International Science Congress: Arms Issues Stressed
(pp 106-113)
(V. Lukov)..... 66

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

- USSR Scientific-Technical Assistance to Developing Countries (pp 114-120)
(S. Tsukanov) (not translated)
- Currency Aspects of the EEC's Agrarian Integration (pp 121-127)
(T. Kosyreva) (not translated)
- Chronic Ailments of the American Cities (pp 127-132)
(L. Kapranova) (not translated)

WE ANSWER READERS' QUESTIONS

- Unemployment in West Europe (pp 133-135)
(N. Vishnevskaya) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

- Book on Social Consequences of Nuclear War Reviewed (pp 136-137)
(V. Yemelyanov)..... 78
- Book on Nuclear War Prevention Measures Reviewed (pp 138-139)
(V. Abarenkov)..... 81
- French Book on NATO Weapons Modernization Criticized (pp 139-141)
(A. Chervyakov)..... 84
- Book on Soviet-Japanese Trade, Technology Transfer Reviewed (pp 141-142)
(Yu. Kuznetsov)..... 88
- I. Bazileva Review of "The U.S., the UN and the Management of Social
Change" edited by T.T. Gati (pp 143-144) (not translated)
- L. Bagramov Review of "Australia and Canada" edited by I.A. Lebedev
(pp 144-146) (not translated)

I. Filatochev Review of "Foreign Capital in Capitalist States' Economy"
by Yu.V. Adzhubey (pp 147-148) (not translated)

Index of Articles for 1985 (pp 149-157)..... 91

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS No 12
Russian title	: MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA
Author(s)	:
Editor(s)	: Ya.S. Khavinson
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"
Place of publication	: Moscow
Date of publication	: December 1985
Signed to press	: November 14, 1985
Copies	: 27,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

ENGLISH SUMMARY OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 158-159

[Text] The article "Leninist Strategy of Building Communism and Strengthening World Security" states that the entire history of world development confirms the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the character and main content of the epoch. The documents which the 27th Congress of the CPSU is to discuss and adopt, the preparations to it prove that the future belongs to socialism and its policy of peace, peaceful coexistence and social progress. The documents and first of all the drafts of new edition of the Program and Rules of the CPSU clearly and deeply characterize the strategic line of the Party. The pre-Congress documents give a profound characteristic of the historic achievements and advantages of socialism and formulate the principle direction of the further development of society. Deep changes are envisaged in the economy. The task of speeding up the social and economic development is the pivot of the new edition of the Program and other pre-Congress documents. The Program embraces a radical renewal of material and technical foundation of society on the basis of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution; refinement of social relations, above all economic; profound changes in the content and character of labor, in people's material and cultural conditions and invigoration of the entire system of political, social and ideological institutions. The article focuses on the need of development of the process of detente being characterized as a natural and essential stage on the road to establishment of a comprehensive and dependable security system. The article points out that the aggressive policy of imperialism is being countered by the growing potential of the forces of peace. This is, first of all, the peaceable policy of the socialist states and their growing economic and defensive might.

V. Kravtsov in the article "USSR-France: New Stage of Dialogue between East and West" shows that M. Gorbachev's visit to France and Soviet-French summit talks represent one of the most outstanding events of present-day international life. The article points out that key problems of concern to entire mankind were discussed. The leaders of the two great powers, while remaining on realistic ground spoke out in favor of curbing the arms race and transferring East-West relations from a state of dangerous confrontation to the channel of detente. The article refers to series of new large-scale Soviet proposals made public during the visit. As a result of the Soviet-French talks M. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand reaffirmed the closeness of their

positions in the matter of preventing the militarization of outer space. European security figured prominently in the talks. The Paris summit gave an impetus to Soviet-French trade and economic ties, scientific and technological cooperation, cultural and other exchanges. The article lays special stress to the continuity and viability of Soviet-French relations which accord with the basic interests of the two countries, the cause of peace and international security.

G.Uranov in the article "USA Storms UNESCO" says that UNESCO in our time is a highly authoritative forum, contributing within its competence to the strengthening of peace and security, to the development of equal and mutually beneficial scientific and cultural cooperation between states and peoples. The article describes the history of the Organization. It points out that at present UNESCO is being pressurized and blackmailed by the Reagan Administration and a number of Western countries precisely because it has taken up the global problems of the time, making its specific contribution to the quest for their solution. Such an orientation of UNESCO activities on pressing world problems was elaborated over the years, in the process of struggle and keen discussions and embodies the major demands and tasks defined by its Constitution. Deliberately distorting UNESCO's activities in the framework of these aforesaid problems trying to eliminate or, at least, radically scale down them and, to divert the Organization away from the new positive directions of its activity which, along with its traditional ones in the sphere of education, science and culture form UNESCO's present image and go a long way to build up its prestige. Washington accused it of going beyond its competence. The article says that the continuing attacks against UNESCO are directed at subverting the entire UN system and as such they run contrary to the interests of the overwhelming majority of states and the interests of the peoples of the world. Having left the Organization the USA continues to instigate and stage-manage through its allies anti-UNESCO campaigns. The article points out that giving in to US dictates and leaving UNESCO without the programs which ensure its participation in defining global tasks of the present time would mean a severe blow not only to the Organization itself but also to the efforts of many countries in finding a solution to the paramount problems which are crucial for mankind's destinies and existence.

The article by V. Lyubimova and Z.Pashetkina "Problems of Female Labor in the Developed Capitalist Countries" investigates different factors which stipulate the intensive inflow of women into the job market. The authors point out that even in the years of crisis the employment rate among women surpasses that among men. The same refers to unemployed women. Despite certain progress in the legislation of capitalist countries working women still remain the more discriminated part of population. The article assesses that political, social and economic inequality of women in every form still exists in capitalist countries.

O. Ulrikh in the article "Role of State in Counteracting Neocolonial Exploitation" emphasizes that a successful struggle of the developing countries against foreign monopolies is possible only if a pole of an economic power opposing them is created. This can be brought about only by enhancing the role of the national state in its socioeconomic development. The author shows

that the direct participation of the state in the economy of the noted countries constitutes the basis of their independent economic policy. Therefore the Western powers are trying hard to weaken it, fearing that the national economy may emerge beyond the framework of the interests of the West. But the expanding economic functions of the state have brought about important though multidimensional changes in the said countries assigning them a new role in world policy and economy. An ever more important role in the struggle against foreign capital is being played by certain state measures of control and regulation of its activities in the sphere of production, trade, credit and investments. The range of these measures is wide. Their efficiency depends on each country's socio-political orientation, its place in the world economy and economic potential, as well as the ways the developing countries will solve different tasks of decolonization including such problems as structural changes, foreign relation's strategy and internal socio-economic transformations.

V. Shubin in the article "Regime of Apartheid-Dimensions of the Crisis" states that the situation which has shaped in the middle of the eighties in South Africa is characterized both by an economic crisis and crisis of internal and external policy of the racist regime. The authorities of Pretoria seek by taking certain steps in their policy to reach political stability and create more favorable conditions for the intensification of the economy, as well as the expansion of the markets and investment of capital in African countries. The reforms being carried out are of different character: some of them are forced concessions to the oppressed majority, others are of purely "cosmetic" character and the third are aimed at the expansion of the regime's social base. But neither these steps of the authorities nor their attempts to draw independent African countries into the sphere of influence of Pretoria have led to desired results. For more than a year a wave of mass meetings and protests against the regime has been sweeping South Africa. It has not been declining despite the emergency measures introduced in many regions of the country. In this situation the representatives of big business and some political organizations of the white majority were obliged to establish contacts with the leaders of the African National Congress thereby acknowledging that it is impossible to solve the fate of the country without its participation.

B. Dobrovinskiy in the article "Scientific and Technological Progress and the Formation of the Capitalist Market of Technical Knowledge" outlines the contemporary features of the technology transfer within the framework of the world capitalist economy. Special emphasis is placed on the so-called commercial forms of technology flows namely licensing operations with patents and "know-how". Abundant statistical data presented in numerous tables support the finding that nowadays licensing operations hold a prominent place in the foreign activity of capitalist companies. The rates of growth of the licensing transactions show their exceeding dynamism in comparison with the subsequent indices relating to the foreign trade operations in conventional commodities and services or with the rates of export of capital. The study of the capitalist market of "techknowledge" gives evidence to the fact that transnational corporations occupy the dominating position in the international technology transfer; the TNC's use the channels of technology exchange striving to strengthen the position of their subsidiaries and capital-related companies in the first place. The author also analyzes the implications of

structural and cyclical crises in 1974-1975 and in the beginning of the 1980's which involved geographical and structural shifts in the capitalist licenses' marketplace. The author specifies the bourgeois state regulation techniques and behaviors aimed to support national corporations in the international competition in the sphere of the technology trade. He points out that the trade in "techknowledge" can appear as the political weapon against the socialist countries and the means of the technological neocolonialism towards the developing states.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

EDITORIAL ON FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF NEW PARTY PROGRAM

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 3-15

[Editorial: "Leninist Strategy of Building Communism and Strengthening Peace"]

[Text]

I

The Soviet people and their Lenin Party are greeting the approaching 27th CPSU Congress with new successes in the all-around improvement of the socialist society and the indefatigable struggle for averting the military catastrophe menacing mankind. The activity of our party invariably manifests the unity of its domestic and international tasks bequeathed by V.I. Lenin, which was strikingly expressed in the draft new version of the CPSU Program. As noted at the CPSU Central Committee October (1985) Plenum, this is a program of the plan-oriented and comprehensive improvement of socialism and the Soviet society's continued advance toward communism on the basis of an acceleration of socioeconomic development and struggle for peace and social progress.

The new version upholds the principle of the continuity of the theoretical and practical aims of party policy. The soundness of the basic content of the current program has been confirmed by life itself. Incontrovertible evidence of this is the country of soviets' considerable advance in the last quarter century in all areas of communist building.

The CPSU Central Committee October Plenum emphasized particularly: the question of continuity in the party's theory and program aims is one of scrupulousness and consistency, fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and responsibility in respect of its own conclusions and evaluations. The CPSU proceeds from a Leninist understanding of continuity, which signifies the creative enrichment of theory and policy, unfailing advance, the removal of everything impeding the cause of communist creation and a critical reinterpretation of formulas which have not stood the test of time.

The preamble to the draft program points out that "the accumulated experience and scientific comprehension of the changes in the country's domestic life and in the world arena afford an opportunity for the more accurate and precise determination of the Soviet society's development prospects, the ways and means of achieving the ultimate goal--communism--and the tasks of international policy under the new historical conditions".

The draft provides a clear and comprehensive description of the strategic areas of the work of the party and the entire Soviet people proceeding from the broad prospect of our society's development en route to communism. It is emphasized particularly that there is no nor could there be any abrupt boundary between socialism and communism for they represent two consecutive phases of the single communist formation. The consolidation of socialism, the increasingly full revelation of its possibilities and advantages and the strengthening of communist principles inherent therein signify society's real movement toward communism. The growth of socialism into communism is determined by the objective laws of society's development. Neither attempts at premature anticipation nor slowness in carrying out urgent transformations and tackling new tasks are permissible.

The draft provides a characterization of the historic achievements and advantages of socialism: "The persistent labor of the Soviet people and the big successes in the economy, the social and political spheres and science and culture brought our country to the new historical frontiers which opened the stage of developed socialism. The task of the utmost and comprehensive improvement of the socialist society and the fuller and more efficient use of its possibilities and advantages became the order of the day".

The concept of acceleration with which communists are approaching the 27th congress is the core of the new version of the program and the other pre-congress documents. It incorporates a fundamental renewal of the material-technical base based on the latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution; an improvement of social relations, economic primarily; profound changes in the content and nature of labor and people's material and spiritual living conditions; and stimulation of the entire system of political, social and ideological institutions.

The new version of the program envisages profound changes in the decisive sphere of human activity--the economy. Imparting a firm material basis to realization of the main goals--rapid growth of the people's well-being and man's all-around development, strengthening of the economic and defense might of the Soviet state--is possible only by having effected an abrupt turnabout toward the intensification of production, having secured the highest level of the organization and efficiency of the economy and given the use of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution. We have to achieve a transition to an economy of the highest organization and efficiency with comprehensively developed productive forces, mature socialist production relations and a well-oiled economic mechanism. A doubling of the country's production potential, given its fundamental qualitative renewal, has to have been achieved before the year 2000.

The party regards social policy as a powerful means of an acceleration of the development of the economy, an uplift of the labor and social-political assertiveness of the masses, the formation of the new man and the establishment of the socialist way of life as an important factor of the political stability of society. Truly impressive tasks are outlined: an unswerving improvement in Soviet people's living and work conditions, the increasingly full realization in all the basic spheres of social relations

of the principle of social justice, rapprochement of the classes and social groups and strata, the surmounting of the essential differences between mental and physical labor and city and countryside, improvement of national relations and a strengthening of the fraternal friendship of all the country's nations and nationalities.

An important task of the party is development of the political system of Soviet society. "The CPSU believes," the draft emphasizes, "that at the current stage the strategic line of development of society's political system consists of an improvement of Soviet democracy and the increasingly full realization of the socialist self-government of the people based on the daily, active and effective participation of the working people and their collectives and organizations in the solution of questions of state and social life".

The leading force of this process is the party--the nucleus of Soviet society's political system. All other elements of the system--the state, trade unions, Komsomol and cooperative and other public organizations--function under its leadership.

The scale, depth and complexity of the tasks being tackled--both domestic and foreign policy--make new, higher demands on the level of party leadership and insistently dictate the need for the mastery of new approaches to all party work. It is this that the proposed changes to the CPSU Rules--the party's Basic Law and communists' code of living--are designed to reflect. Their essence is bringing the demands of the current rules into line with the draft new version of the CPSU Program. The connection between these documents is direct and indissoluble. Whereas the program is, in Lenin's words, "a concise, clear and precise statement of all that the party is striving and fighting for," the rules are "the common judgment concerning the forms and standards of party organization" and "jointly adopted rules of organization...." The unity of the party's ideological and organizational principles and theory and practice is hereby guaranteed.

Created by V.I. Lenin, the CPSU has traveled a glorious path. The sociopolitical and ideological unity of the multinational Soviet state has taken shape and is strengthening constantly under its leadership. Worthily performing the mission of tested combat vanguard of the Soviet people, nucleus of the political system and guiding and directing force of society, the party determines the general prospects of the country's development and imparts to the struggle for the triumph of communist ideals organization, plan-conformity and purposefulness. With the growth of the scale and complication of the creative tasks there is naturally an increase in its leading role and, consequently, responsibility to society and the people.

In determining the tasks and areas of ideological work the party proceeds from the need to do everything to make full use of the effective, transforming force of Marxist-Leninist ideology for the purpose of an acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. An unfailing demand made of political-educational work is unity of word and deed--a most important principle of all party and state activity. This imbues the party's plans in the sphere of public education, science, cultural building, literature and art also.

The entire course of world development confirms the soundness of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the nature and basic content of the modern era. It is the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism and the historical competition of the two world sociopolitical systems, the era of socialist and national liberation revolutions and the downfall of colonialism, the era of the struggle of the main driving forces of social development--world socialism, the worker and communist movements, the peoples of the emergent states and mass democratic movements--against imperialism and its policy of aggression and oppression and for democracy and social progress.

In preparing the new version of its program the CPSU proceeded from a realistic evaluation of the correlation and alignment of forces in the world and the basic trends of world development. As a result a clear and scientifically substantiated program of further actions in the name of man and mankind and for the sake of peace in the world was elaborated. "We speak openly about the aims of our international policy and the ways of achieving them," the platform of the CPSU Central Committee October Plenum emphasized. "In this sense our policy is entirely predictable, it contains no enigmas and uncertainties. It is a policy based on Lenin's idea of the peaceful coexistence of the two opposite systems. We proceed from the fact that only a stable and reliable policy befits states and parties conscious of their responsibility for the fate of peace in our contradiction-packed age".

From the first days of its existence the Soviet state has struggled consistently for peace, against aggression and for the prevention of wars. "The Soviet Union," the draft emphasizes, "is emphatically opposed to attempts to forcibly halt and turn back the course of history. The peoples' interests demand that interstate relations be channeled into peaceful competition and equal cooperation".

The 5-year period which has elapsed since the 26th party congress has provided much evidence of the fidelity of the CPSU and the Soviet state to these great goals. The complex, rapidly changing situation has invariably demanded an immediate and correct reaction to the new processes, phenomena and trends in international affairs and an ability to reveal in good time the appearance of features in the policy of imperialist reaction most dangerous for the cause of peace. Thanks to the timely promotion of constructive, realistic initiatives, it has been possible to weaken considerably the negative impact of such trends on the entire system of international relations. The militarist, aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States and other imperialist states could already have led to truly catastrophic consequences had it not encountered firm and opportune counteraction on the part of the USSR, the socialist community as a whole and all the planet's peace-loving forces. It may be asserted with confidence that the counteroffensive of imperialism in the international arena which began on the frontier of the current decade has become bogged down, having come up against the firm and indestructible rebuff of the forces of socialism and peace.

Prevention of a nuclear catastrophe has become the central task in the modern era. In making a decisive contribution to the cause of ensuring peace in the world the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are successfully performing a duty of historic significance--saving mankind from perdition in the flames of a new war. These noble aims of the international policy of socialism are profoundly consonant with the vital interests of all mankind.

Soviet foreign policy derives its strength from the unity of the international and the national and the universal approach to the paramount problem of the present day--the problem of war and peace. The roots of its effectiveness lie in the profound and all-around scientific analysis of world problems and the creative interpretation of the complex, manifold and constantly changing phenomena and processes of the international reality of our day. An inexhaustible reserve of the foreign policy of socialism is the fact that it is based on the unanimous approval and support of the entire Soviet people and the powerful economic and defense potential created by their heroic labor. A powerful source of its effectiveness consists of its class character reflecting the interests of the social forces to whom the future belongs and scrupulousness, democratic character, openness and honesty.

The foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the 1980's embraces the most important areas of the struggle for the consolidation of peace, an easing of international tension and arms limitation and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It is difficult to exaggerate the role and significance of the far-reaching initiatives which the Soviet Union has advanced recently and the actions it has embarked on for the purpose of easing the military danger. In spite of imperialism's aspiration to put the emphasis on military-power methods, the CPSU and the Soviet state are fully resolved to achieve a fundamental positive breakthrough in international affairs.

III

In the year now departing the peoples commemorated a splendid date--the 40th anniversary of the victory over the dark forces of barbarity and evil. The decisive contribution to the smashing of German fascism and Japanese militarism was made by the Soviet Union and its armed forces. The memory of the Soviet people's great exploit in people's consciousness will never dim, and gratitude to them for salvation of the world from the brown plague will be preserved forever.

The great victory began a new chapter in world history. There was a qualitative change in the alignment of forces in the world arena. The world socialist system, which became the vanguard of the struggle of all democratic, progressive forces against the aggressive, hegemonist aspirations and actions of the reactionary circles of imperialism, arose. Lenin's prediction that the new social system would give birth to international relations of a fundamentally different nature, free of the relations of domination and subordination inherent in capitalism, was corroborated.

The new type of interstate relations was embodied with the greatest fullness in the socialist community--a community of sovereign, equal peoples rallied by unity of fundamental interests and goals and Marxist-Leninist ideology and forged by ties of fraternal solidarity and mutual assistance and all-around cooperation.

In 40 years the countries of the community have trodden a truly giant path in the creation of the new society. It has not been easy and straight. There have been many difficulties and mistakes at times. However, the main result is obvious: a society embodying the age-old dreams of the working people was created and consolidated and is developing in each fraternal country thanks to the heroic efforts of the working people's masses under the leadership of the communist parties.

The socialist countries' relative significance in the world economy is growing constantly. In the last 15 years alone the CEMA states have doubled industrial production, whereas capitalism in this period has increased it by little more than one-third.

In the modern era the socialist community has become that most authoritative force without which no question of world politics can be decided. It invariably displays the initiative in the search for solutions of cardinal international problems. It is precisely thanks to the responsible, realistic and constructive peace-loving foreign policy of the community of socialist states that mankind has been living under conditions of peace for more than 40 years now.

"A subject of the CPSU's particular concern," the draft new version of the program emphasizes, "is the strengthening in every possible way of the friendship and development and improvement of the relations of the Soviet Union with the socialist community countries".

The community countries' interaction is fruitful in all walks of life. Their fraternal alliance is embodied in the Warsaw Pact, CEMA, the system of bilateral friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance treaties and various forms and mechanisms of multilateral cooperation.

The tasks of a further improvement of the political interaction of the community countries, an increase in the efficiency and efficacy of their cooperation and rapprochement in various spheres are constantly at the center of the attention of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. The main role here is performed by the Warsaw Pact, which is reliably safeguarding the sovereignty of the fraternal countries and the security and indestructibility of their borders. The allied states' unanimous decision to extend the Warsaw Pact reflects their unbending will to strengthen friendship and jointly pursue a concerted policy in international affairs. There is not nor has there been historically another such alliance in which relations have been based on the genuine equality and comradely mutual assistance of the states and peoples.

An important contribution to the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the fraternal parties and countries and the increased coordination of their foreign policy activity is made by top-level meetings. The understandings reached serve as the basis for the coordination of efforts in the accomplishment of the tasks confronting them.

The results of the meetings of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee and other meetings of leaders of the socialist community countries held in recent years convincingly demonstrate their will to peace. The declarations adopted at the meetings and the initiatives they have presented confirm the invariable aspiration of the Soviet state and its allies to ensure that contentious issues be settled not by force of arms but by peaceful means, at the negotiating table. The Warsaw Pact states advocate the surmounting of dangerous tension, an improvement in the European and world political climate and a change for the better in international affairs.

Meetings of leaders of Warsaw Pact parties and states have studied in depth the situation in Europe connected with the deployment of new American intermediate-range missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries. The socialist community countries invariably declare that they have never aspired and do not now aspire to achieve military superiority, but will in no event permit military superiority over themselves.

"The Warsaw Pact states," the statement of the Political Consultative Committee Sofia meeting observes, "will continue to consistently pursue a policy of an increase in the efficiency of mutual cooperation in all spheres based on the harmonious combination of their national and international interests. They intend to unite their efforts to an increasing extent for the purpose of the dynamic socioeconomic development of the fraternal countries based on an acceleration of scientific-technical progress and a further rise in their peoples' well-being".

Fundamental significance, as the communication issued on 1 November on the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session observed, is attached to the idea promoted by the meeting of the need to impart a global nature to international scientific-technical cooperation and to subordinate it solely to peaceful purposes.

The international authority of CEMA and its positive impact on the fraternal countries' economic development and the world economy as a whole have increased. An important stage in its activity was started by the top-level CEMA economic conference in June 1984 in Moscow. The collective analysis made thereat determined the parties' strategy at the current state, the specific ways and means of the continued extension of socialist economic integration and the priority areas of the fraternal states' economic cooperation. The conference's decisions are contributing to the effective development of the national economies, the growth of the peoples' well-being and a multiplication of the might of the socialist world.

The results of the Sofia meeting confirmed once again that the fraternal countries' economic strategy is inseparably connected with the struggle for peace and international detente. They consistently aspire to an improvement in international economic relations, the economic independence of all states, large and small, and the establishment of trust in this most important sphere. The CEMA countries advocate a search for constructive ways of developing peaceful, stable international political and economic relations given consideration of the existing realities in the world and the interests of all states.

The fraternal parties are doing everything for the continued ideological rapprochement of their peoples and a strengthening of the sense of internationalism. Questions of ideology and the ideological struggle have been illustrated extensively in the work of the fraternal parties' central committee plenums and in the course of meetings and contacts between party figures and statesmen of the community. Meetings of secretaries of the socialist countries' communist and workers party central committees on international and ideological issues have become regular.

IV

The present stage of world development is characterized by a confrontation of the two opposite world outlooks, ideologies and policy courses of unprecedented scale, intensity and seriousness. A struggle of ideas of unprecedented tension and intensity has developed. The CPSU believes that it is exceptionally important to convey to people's minds and hearts the truth about the socialist society, its advantages, its peace-loving foreign policy and the unshakable alliance of the fraternal peoples. Exposure of the lies and slander being disseminated by bourgeois propaganda concerning the countries of real socialism and all attempts to embellish the situation in the capitalist countries themselves has become just as important a task.

In the attempts to "replay" history, settle the outcome of the confrontation of the two systems in their favor and restore to themselves the positions of military leadership U.S. ruling circles are paying ever growing attention to the tasks of weakening the socialist community and undermining socialism "from within". Extensive use is being made for this purpose of methods of the notorious "differentiated policy". With astounding arrogance imperialist circles arrogate to themselves the "right" to "encourage" some socialist countries and to "punish" others. The events of the 1980's have shown repeatedly that hostile actions of a political and economic nature are being conducted and ideological sabotage, subversive acts and other steps impermissible in the practice of interstate relations are being implemented against the socialist countries.

Rebuffing the enemies of socialism, the peoples of the fraternal countries realize even more deeply how great under present conditions is the significance of proletarian, socialist internationalism and profound recognition of the unity of national and international interests. Defense of the revolutionary gains of the working people in individual countries and the strengthening of the socialist community is a common cause requiring joint and active efforts.

The 5-year period which has elapsed since the 26th CPSU Congress has confirmed once again that, embodying the highest level of the social progress of mankind, the socialist community possesses everything necessary for the successful accomplishment of the most complex and large-scale tasks of social development. There is no doubt that the further consolidation of the unity of the socialist countries also may be achieved on the basis of a strict consideration both of the national interests of each of them and the community as a whole, consideration of the entire complexity and, sometimes, contradictoriness of

the processes occurring within individual socialist countries and in their mutual relations. The fraternal countries are confidently advancing and will continue to advance by joint efforts, ascending to increasingly high levels of their economic and social maturity.

As the draft program observes, the CPSU is consistently pursuing a policy of an extension of the Soviet Union's relations with the emergent countries and has a profoundly sympathetic attitude toward the aspirations of peoples which have experienced the burdensome, humiliating yoke of colonial slavery. The Soviet Union is building its relations with these countries on the basis of strict respect for their independence and equality and supports their struggle against the neocolonialist policy of imperialism and the vestiges of colonialism and for peace and general security.

The Soviet Union has been and remains a loyal ally of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in their struggle for national independence. It emphatically condemns infringement of the sovereignty of the young states and interference in any form in their internal affairs. The peoples of these countries must be guaranteed the right to peaceful development under conditions of independence.

The USSR's economic cooperation with the developing countries is expanding: specialists are being trained in various spheres of science and technology, training centers, institutes and technical high schools are being built and hundreds of industrial enterprises, power engineering complexes and agricultural facilities have been installed with its help. In helping the peoples of the emergent countries create the basis of an independent national economy the Soviet Union is invariably supporting their struggle for the establishment of just international relations and a strengthening of political independence and expressing solidarity with their struggle for a just international economic order, full liberation from exploitation on the part of the imperialist states and deliverance from the debt slavery imposed by imperialism.

A substantial contribution to the struggle for the preservation of peace in the world and removal of the threat of thermonuclear war, a curbing of the arms race and the development of equal cooperation between states is being made by the nonaligned movement, the chairman of which is currently peace-loving India. The Soviet Union notes particularly this movement's growing role in international affairs and the intensification of anti-imperialist and antiwar trends in the foreign policy of the nonaligned states. As the draft program points out, the CPSU has an understanding attitude toward the goals and activity of the nonaligned movement and supports an increase in its role in world politics.

A characteristic feature of our time is the upsurge of mass democratic movements in the nonsocialist world. The antagonism between the monopolies and the vast majority of the population is intensifying in the capitalist countries. The intelligentsia, employees, the farmers, representatives of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national minorities and the youth and students are joining increasingly actively in the struggle against the domination of the monopolies and the reactionary policy of the ruling classes.

People of varying political persuasions are demanding an end to the militarization of society and the policy of aggression and war and an end to racial and national discrimination, infringement of women's rights, the deterioration of the position of the younger generation, corruption and predatory attitude of the monopolies toward the use of natural resources and the environment. These movements are objectively directed against the policy of reactionary imperialist circles and are developing into a common stream of struggle for social progress.

V

The relations of states with different social systems and their confrontation and cooperation have assumed global proportions in the modern era, and a problem common to all mankind is being tackled in this sphere--the problem of war and peace.

The consistent policy of real socialism, which is not subject to market-related fluctuations and which is based on a profound scientific analysis of the processes of social development, proceeds from the fact that any attempt to transfer the confrontation of the socioeconomic systems into the military plane will inevitably lead to the death of modern civilization and life on Earth itself.

Socialism exerts its main influence on the course of world history by economic successes. Military force cannot be a means of settling political, economic and ideological contradictions. "Socialism," the draft program notes, "proves its advantages not by force of arms but by force of example in all spheres of social life--by the dynamic development of the economy, science and culture, the rise in the working people's living standard and the extension of socialist democracy."

As far as imperialism's approach to relations with the socialist world are concerned, two lines are most intricately interwoven therein. The first presupposes recognition--albeit it often forced--of the need for peaceful coexistence and the relaxation of international tension. The second is oriented primarily toward rigid power opposition, political confrontation and the "economic exhaustion" of socialism.

In the 1980's it is precisely the second line which has become predominant in the policy of imperialism--as a result of the strengthening of the positions of militarist circles in Western countries. Rejecting the search for mutually acceptable solutions of contentious international problems, these circles are endeavoring, by reliance on force, to "seize" the historical initiative, squeeze out socialism and strengthen the global positions of imperialism. "As a result international development," M.S. Gorbachev points out, "has approached a line which cannot be crossed without the adoption of decisions which are the height of responsibility aimed at imposing a limit on the arms race and halting the slide toward war. These decisions cannot be postponed without a risk of dangerous processes threatening mankind's very existence getting out of control."

Imperialist reaction is setting itself far-reaching goals of undermining the positions of real socialism, securing its undivided sway in the world arena and the forcible imposition on mankind of the system of capitalist oppression and exploitation which has had its day. The task of liquidating--with the aid of military forces, if necessary--the very prerequisites of anti-imperialist transformations in the developing world in order to weaken, isolate or do away with progressive, democratic movements there and oust regimes which have embarked on a path of a socialist orientation is set.

To achieve these goals the reactionary circles are mobilizing all the resources currently at the disposal of present-day imperialism. They intend on the basis of the use of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution gaining decisive technological and economic superiority over the socialist world. It is contemplated using this superiority both directly for political purposes and for the achievement on a new scientific-technical basis of a preponderance in the military field--in the sphere of both strategic and conventional arms.

endeavoring to ensure the success of the global counteroffensive against the positions of socialism, the West's ultrareactionary forces are striving for unification of the efforts of the three centers of the rivalry of present-day imperialism and the establishment of effective coordination of action among them.

The danger of such trends in policy is obvious: they have already been destructively reflected in the entire system of international relations, which have been cast back several years, to the worst times of the cold war period.

The dominant role in the pursuit of this antipopular policy, which is creating a direct threat to peace and the very existence of the human race, is being performed by American imperialism. The greatest danger is contained in the United States' gamble on a revival of "nuclear superiority" by way of an acceleration of the arms race and the spurring of unchecked rivalry in the nuclear missile sphere.

The nuclear and space programs being implemented by the present U.S. Administration have a clear orientation toward the acquisition of first-strike potential. This is confirmed by the particularly dangerous properties of the arms being created in the United States (increased accuracy and destructive power and reduced flight time). A sharp increase in the number of nuclear warheads is planned for the 1980's. The development and improvement of new strategic weapons systems are being undertaken very intensively. Hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars are being generously allocated for the creation of increasingly sophisticated weapons for exterminating people. The United States has recently been energetically developing ideas and plans for the creation of attack space-based systems and "star wars" programs within the framework of the so-called "strategic defense initiative".

The USSR is emphatically opposed to any plans for the militarization of space. Of course, the Soviet Union possesses sufficient economic and scientific-technical potential for opportunely responding to any attempts to break up the military-strategic balance. But the fundamental position of the USSR

amounts to preventing the start of an arms race in space, halting such on Earth and embarking on a radical reduction in existing nuclear arsenals, primarily the most dangerous and destabilizing weapons systems, as far as their complete and final elimination.

The military-strategic parity achieved as a result of the purposeful policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and thanks to Soviet people's selfless labor, the peace-loving foreign policy course of the USSR and its allies and recognition of the indissolubility of concluded treaties and agreements--such are the fundamental principles of the security of the USSR and its friends and allies.

To the dangerous policy of the United States the Soviet Union invariably counterposes its constructive, realistic line aimed at a limitation of and reduction in arms and a lessening of the threat of nuclear war. Consistently advocating the creation of a system of firm international security and endeavoring to enlist all states in this process, the USSR has in recent years taken by way of a display of good will a number of important steps of a unilateral nature for the purpose of putting an end to the arms race. These include the commitment assumed by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In April 1985 the USSR unilaterally suspended the further deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and other retaliatory measures in Europe. On 6 August the Soviet Union--again unilaterally--imposed a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until the end of 1985. The USSR could consent to an extension of the moratorium after 1 January 1986 if it is joined by the United States. Replying to the joint message of the six leaders of the Delhi Declaration states, M.S. Gorbachev declared the Soviet Union's readiness even now for the permanent treaty prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests.

The new Soviet proposals which M.S. Gorbachev put forward during his visit to France serve the historic goal of a radical reduction in and ultimately the liquidation of nuclear arms. The Soviet Union has presented a comprehensive program of realistic measures aimed at a cardinal improvement in the international atmosphere. It has proposed that the United States negotiate a total prohibition for both sides of attack space-based weapons and a truly radical, 50-percent, reduction in nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

In order to facilitate an accord on the speediest mutual reduction in intermediate-range weapons in Europe the Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of a corresponding agreement separately, not directly linked with the problem of a space-based and strategic arms. A readiness was expressed here for direct negotiations with France and Britain on the question of the place of their nuclear potential with regard for the interests of these countries' security.

Addressing members of France's National Assembly, the Soviet leader reported that the number of SS-20 missiles which the USSR has on alert duty in the European zone corresponds precisely to the level of June 1984, when the

additional deployment of Soviet missiles in response to the appearance in Europe of the American intermediate-range missiles began. The missiles additionally deployed in this connection have now been removed from alert duty.

The significance of the new USSR initiatives is tremendous. A halt to the race in nuclear arms and subsequently a substantial reduction therein and prevention of the militarization of space would appreciably lessen tension throughout the world, primarily on the European continent. The military-political situation here as a whole remains complex. Tension not only continues but is increasing to a certain extent and the military threat is growing, for which together with the United States the ruling circles of a number of West European countries bear their share of responsibility.

This is in sharp contrast with the mood of broad public circles of the said countries, which realize that the exacerbation of the military confrontation is fraught with the grimmest consequences for West Europe and is undermining the real possibilities of truly peaceful coexistence on the continent. It is this which has to a considerable extent brought about the differences in the approach of the West European countries and the United States to questions of cooperation, economic included, with the European socialist states.

Only under conditions of a relaxation of international tension will Europe acquire true security. Particular significance is attached in this plane to a lowering of the level of the sides' military confrontation in the sphere of both nuclear and conventional arms. Together with its Warsaw Pact allies the USSR is keeping up its efforts to achieve progress at the Vienna talks on a reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Aspiring to bring the positions of the sides closer, the socialist participants in the talks have submitted more than 20 proposals all told of both an all-embracing and partial nature.

Within the framework of a draft submitted by the socialist states in Vienna the USSR would also be prepared for appreciable control measures, including the invitation of observers, the establishment of permanent posts on each side monitoring the withdrawal of troops, mutual notification of certain aspects of military activity, exchange of information, the creation of a mutual consultation mechanism and others. However, the NATO countries are, as before, avoiding constructive dialogue.

The confidence-building measures in the military sphere being implemented in accordance with a decision of the All-European Conference are also contributing to a normalization of the situation on the European continent and a strengthening of international security. Both prior notification of large-scale military exercises and the invitation of observers thereto and notification of large-scale troop movements have been serving this goal for a number of years now.

The 26th CPSU Congress proposed, as is known, an appreciable expansion of the zone of application of such measures and expressed the readiness to extend them to the entire European part of the USSR on condition of a

corresponding extension of the zone of confidence-building measures on the part of the Western states also. As a result of the constructive position of the USSR and other socialist community countries the final document of the Madrid meeting of All-European Conference participants included a provision according to which confidence-building measures will encompass all of Europe and also the adjacent maritime area and air space. At the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe the USSR is advocating that the Helsinki Final Act be practically developed in new important accords.

A general increase in international tension as a result of the policy of imperialist circles has been manifested distinctly in the recent period in the Asia-Pacific region, the military-political atmosphere in which is largely determined by the position of the United States and Japan. Military cooperation between them is developing rapidly. Bilateral Japanese-American exercises and multilateral military maneuvers are, in particular, an important component thereof. The U.S. military presence in the region, on Japanese territory included, is being increased and modernized with Tokyo's assistance. The United States is persistently urging Japan to increase its military spending, expand the functions of the "self-defense forces" and speed up rearmament. The trilateral military-political measures of the United States, Japan and South Korea, given the leading and coordinating role of the United States, serve to secure the interests of imperialism.

The American armed forces remain imperialism's main military support in the Asia-Pacific region and, accordingly, the main threat to the peace and security of the peoples inhabiting it. The United States has markedly increased its military presence in the Pacific and Indian oceans in the first half of the current decade. The numbers of its armed forces have grown sharply and the modernization and technical reequipment of the 7th Fleet, including provision of the ships with new cruise missiles, are under way. The Pentagon is strengthening military-political relations with the ASEAN countries and making incessant efforts aimed at converting this organization into a military bloc directed primarily against the Indochina states.

The USSR has advocated and continues to advocate a consolidation of security in Asia and an improvement of relations with all states of the region on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The idea of a comprehensive approach to security in Asia and the Pacific put forward by the Soviet Union serves this goal.

The years which have elapsed since the 26th CPSU Congress have been difficult in the international political plane. World reaction has succeeded in making the overall climate of international relations considerably worse, increasing the tension therein along the main line of confrontation of the two systems, appreciably weakening the trend toward detente and narrowing its range, developing an arms race of unprecedented scale and intensity and increasing the direct threat of nuclear war.

However, as the draft new version of the program emphasizes, world war is not a fatal inevitability. Preventing war and saving mankind from catastrophe is possible. This is the historic calling of socialism and all progressive, peace-loving forces of our planet.

The offensive of the forces of peace and progress continues. It has accelerated anew in recent months. The party will strive for the development of the process of the relaxation of international tension, regarding it as a natural and necessary stage en route to the creation of an all-embracing and dependable system of security. The available experience of cooperation confirms the feasibility of such a prospect. The CPSU supports the creation and use of international mechanisms and institutions which would make it possible to find the optimum correlations of national, state interests with interests common to all mankind. It supports an increase in the role of the United Nations in the strengthening of peace and the development of international cooperation.

Particular responsibility lies with the nuclear powers. States possessing nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction must renounce their use and the threat of their use and refrain from steps leading to an exacerbation of the international situation.

The CPSU supports normal, stable relations between the Soviet Union and the United States presupposing noninterference in internal affairs, respect for one another's legitimate interests, recognition and implementation in practice of the principle of equal security and the establishment on this basis of as great mutual trust as possible. Differences in social systems and ideologies are not a reason for tense relations. There are objective prerequisites for the establishment of fruitful mutually profitable Soviet-American cooperation in various spheres.

The CPSU attaches great significance to the further development of the peaceful good-neighborliness and cooperation of European states. An inalienable condition of the stability of positive processes in this, as in other regions, is respect for the territorial-political realities which took shape as a result of WWII. The CPSU is emphatically opposed to attempts to revise them on whatever pretext and will rebuff any manifestations of revanchism.

The growing potential of the peace forces is opposed to the aggressive policy of imperialism. This means the active, consistently peace-loving policy of the socialist states and their growing economic and defense might. The policy of the overwhelming majority of Asian, African and Latin American states, which have a vital interest in the preservation of peace and a halt to the arms race. And antiwar movements of the broadest people's masses on all continents, which have become a long-term and influential factor of social life. A sober consideration of the actual correlation of forces is leading to an understanding of the danger of a continuation and expansion of the arms race on the part of many statesmen and politicians of the capitalist countries.

The documents which are to be discussed and adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress and the entire preparation therefor testify once again that the future is on the side of socialism and its policy of peace, peaceful coexistence and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

ARMS CONTROL, BILATERAL ISSUES IN GORBACHEV VISIT TO FRANCE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNAROPNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 16-21

[Article by V. Kravtsov: "USSR-France: New Stage of East-West Dialogue"]

[Text] The official visit to France of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium (2-5 October), his meetings and talks with President F. Mitterrand and other of France's statesmen and politicians and his speeches have evoked tremendous interest everywhere in the world and been greeted benevolently as a whole

The significance of the Soviet-French top-level meeting goes far beyond the framework of purely bilateral relations. It is not just that this was M.S. Gorbachev's first official visit as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to a Western country. A situation has taken shape in the world currently which demands responsible decisions and actions, primarily on the part of states which exert a significant influence on the course of international events. The continuation of the arms race, which has assumed unprecedented proportions, and its spread to space are fraught with the most serious consequences for the fate of human civilization. Indeed, if the latest achievements of science and technology are put to the service of the god of war, the course of events could become uncontrollable.

Creating a better, safer world, ensuring progress and striving for an improvement in the international atmosphere is only possible if this becomes the common cause of all states, regardless of their social system. Granted all the difference of political systems, ideologies and world outlooks, mankind has common goals and ideals, the main ones of which are dependable peace, security, independence and free development. It is essential to learn to live together, considering one another's interests in our real world. This is contained in the Soviet Union's understanding of peaceful coexistence in the broad meaning of the word.

Having cast aside outmoded stereotypes of political thinking, it is necessary in the modern era to fully renounce the futile, but increasingly dangerous illusions of the achievement of military superiority, imperial policy and the practice of international affairs from a "position of strength". The mere idea

of a strengthening of security by way of piling up more and more lethal types of arms, as, equally, attempts to extricate oneself from the nuclear standoff thanks to the creation of qualitatively new weapons systems and the extension of the arms race to space, are absurd in the present overarmed world. Ensuring one's own security at the expense of the security of others is impossible.

The Soviet leadership is not only putting forward a progressive concept corresponding to the demands of the current stage of international relations--the concept of peaceful coexistence--but also exerting energetic, imaginative efforts for its realization. The Soviet Union's words are not at variance with its deeds, and this is demonstrated convincingly by a whole number of actions upon which it has unilaterally embarked recently.

Active East-West political dialogue is more necessary than ever under current conditions, particularly because the supporters of confrontation are doing everything for a growth of misunderstanding, alienation and even hostility between states. It is necessary to know one another's viewpoints better, ascertain spheres of contact and a balance sheet of interests and to establish if only a minimum of trust. This was the serious political-psychological load of the top-level Soviet-French negotiations.

Relations between our two countries and peoples go back into the depths of history. Soviet-French political dialogue has for several decades now been a major, it may be said, irreplaceable value in European and world politics. In the past the Soviet Union and France have repeatedly been the initiators of positive changes in the international arena. And it does no one any harm that contacts between them today, at the top level included, are once again becoming concentrated and that relations as a whole are acquiring progressive dynamics.

Immediately upon arrival in Paris M.S. Gorbachev declared: "The USSR is prepared for constructive dialogue with states of a different social system and a search for solutions of accumulated European and world problems, primarily a return to detente, prevention of an arms race in space and a halt thereto on Earth and movement toward new frontiers of international cooperation." This is quintessentially the Soviet concept of the visit.

Jumping ahead, we would note that this concept was realized in full in the course of the negotiations. Summing them up, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary emphasized the thought that both states--the Soviet Union and France--each in its actual situation, were able to transcend existing differences and analyze the ongoing processes in the world, compare their evaluations and exchange opinions concerning what their contribution might be to ensuring that events in the world and the international situation change for the better.

Of course, on a number of questions, important ones, moreover, there are entirely understandable differences between the two countries ensuing from their membership of different social systems and military-political alliances and the specifics of the analysis of the events occurring in the world. At the same time--and this is the main thing, of course--a general understanding

was ascertained in the course of the negotiations of the need to do everything possible to improve the situation and assist a change from confrontation to relaxation of tension. The determining result of the meeting was the fact that the participants in the negotiations, as declared on the Soviet side, "felt the urgent need for a return to detente".

The Soviet Union's new far-reaching initiatives pertaining to a curbing and turning back of the nuclear arms race which were announced in Paris have evoked tremendous international comment.

A practical basis for a sharp reduction in the level of nuclear confrontation and the simultaneous prevention of an arms race in space is created by the USSR's proposal on banning the creation, testing and deployment of attack space arms and reducing in this event by 50 percent the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States which are capable of reaching each other's territory.

Apart from its main significance, the Soviet proposal creates a qualitatively different situation also as far as the problem of nuclear arms in Europe is concerned. Endeavoring to impart the necessary dynamics to the negotiations in this field, the Soviet Union expressed a readiness to conclude a separate agreement on this category of arms not directly linked with the problem of space and strategic arms. This readiness is an appreciable step forward in the direction of the wishes primarily of the West European states, which affords them a real chance to play an active part in the solution of this vitally important question.

Simultaneously the USSR proposed to France and Britain a start on a direct exchange of opinions on the subject of the corresponding arms and an attempt by joint efforts to find a mutually acceptable solution of the European "nuclear equation".

The Soviet leader's communication to the effect that the number of SS-20 missiles which the USSR has on alert duty in the European zone now constitutes 243 was received with interest. This corresponds precisely to the level of June 1984, when the additional deployment of Soviet missiles in response to the deployment in West Europe of the American intermediate-range missiles began. It was also declared that the additionally installed SS-20 missiles had at the present time been taken off alert duty and that the fixed launchers would be dismantled.

Following some confusion, the opponents of disarmament began feverishly to look for "arguments" designed to belittle the significance of the Soviet initiatives and weaken their magnetic force for millions of people, primarily those actively struggling for the preservation of peace. Talk about some "imbalance" of the USSR's proposals and their alleged "one-sidedness" was circulated. And such insinuations were aimed at a country which is indeed adopting unilateral measures to curb the arms race and signaling in practice its readiness to reach intelligent compromise. The unseemly attempts to discredit the Soviet approach conceal a further unseemly aim--avoiding purposeful discussion of an arms reduction and leaving military programs untouched.

The solution of the problem of a reduction in strategic offensive arms is connected with preventing an arms race in space. This objective interconnection is recognized by the French leadership also. The talks in Paris showed once again that it does not share the doctrines forming the basis of Reagan's "strategic defense initiative" and opposes the conversion of space into a new arena of military rivalry. Pursuing an active policy in the sphere of the use and conquest of near-Earth space, within the framework of the European Space Agency included, France is interested in space remaining peaceful. In this connection attention was called to F. Mitterrand's pronouncement at a joint press conference with M.S. Gorbachev that France "will not participate in any forms of the creation of space-based weapons." There are other methods of the conquest of space and its use by mankind, the president emphasized.

These are indicated, incidentally, by the proposal for international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization submitted by the Soviet Union at the UN General Assembly 40th Session. It was greeted with interest in France. We would recall here that in 1978, at the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session, France had submitted its own proposal concerning the creation of an international observation satellite agency for the purpose of maintaining strategic stability and verifying compliance with international agreements in the disarmament sphere. The Soviet proposal is undoubtedly broader than the French, but they are not incompatible, and individual ideas of the French side could evidently be embodied in the process of the creation of the world space organization proposed by the USSR.

As a whole, the exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes is a sphere of cooperation in which impressive results have been achieved between our countries. The fact that the agreement on cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space, which was signed in 1966, was one of the first Soviet-French documents since the war is noteworthy in itself. Even then the sides proceeded from the fact that as science and technology developed, mankind would be cultivating the space field increasingly actively. History has fully corroborated the soundness of this conclusion. Currently our countries have to their credit more than 40 joint experiments pertaining to the peaceful study of circumterrestrial space and other heavenly bodies. The French cosmonaut J.-L. Chretien, who participated in the joint flight of the Soviet orbital station in 1982, was the first West European to have seen our planet from space. New scientific experiments are on the agenda today. The members of the recently formed French cosmonauts team evidently perceived with interest the agreement in principle reached in the course of the visit concerning a French cosmonaut's participation in a long expedition on board a Soviet orbital space station.

Both sides emphasized in the course of the negotiations that the task of a complete ban on chemical weapons and the liquidation of stockpiles thereof was becoming increasingly urgent. The Soviet Union and France advocate the accelerated preparation of the appropriate international convention at the Geneva Disarmament Conference and will exert efforts to this end, taking advantage of the existing points of contact on this question in the positions of the two countries.

As is known, the USSR has expressed a readiness to take part in the formulation of an international accord on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons, which would move in the general channel of efforts for a total prohibition thereof. The Soviet side has also expressed support for the proposal of the GDR and CSSR governments concerning the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in Central Europe.

A particular place at the negotiations was occupied by discussion of problems of European security. The interconnected and interwoven nature of the fate of the peoples populating Europe, despite the difference in the social paths they have chosen, is perhaps perceived more acutely here than anywhere else. On account of its geographical compactness and oversaturation with arms, Europe is more vulnerable than any other continent in the face of a military conflict, nuclear even more. Europe's present situation reflects in concentrated form, as it were, the entire fragility of the modern world.

In the past the Soviet Union and France made a big contribution to the organization of the all-European process and the establishment in international life of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different sociopolitical systems. Today this valuable capital of cooperation could be used successfully for continuing the all-European process based on the historic Helsinki Final Act and suffusing it with new content. The Soviet Union supports an enhancement of Europe's role in efforts pertaining to an improvement in the international climate.

During discussion of the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe (and the USSR and France initiated its convening) both sides have expressed an opinion concerning the need for an increase in the pace of its work and its speediest transition to the formulation of actual accords in order to have completed the first stage of the conference with substantial, meaningful results by next summer, prior to the start of the next meeting of the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This would undoubtedly exert a salutary influence on the evolution of the international situation on the European continent and in the world as a whole.

Due attention was paid at the negotiations to an examination of regional problems and the world's "flash points". There is mutual understanding between the two countries in the evaluation of some of them, like, for example, the situation in the Near East, in Central America and in Southern Africa. On others there are differences both in analysis and approach. The main thing, however, is that the Soviet Union and France agree on one point--these hotbeds need to be extinguished by political means given full respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country.

The political climate in Europe and beyond depends to a considerable extent on how East-West economic relations develop. The scale of the problems confronting mankind on the threshold of the third millennium goes far beyond a national framework and requires the more efficient use of the international division of labor. The establishment of official practical relations between the continent's two biggest economic groupings--CEMA and the EEC--is

of undoubted interest to the two parts of Europe in this connection. The CEMA countries displayed a constructive initiative, which is being discussed in the European Community's bodies. It is now important that this be followed by specific results. Much will depend here on France, which performs, as is known, a substantial role in the European community. It was again emphasized that to the extent to which the Common Market countries act as a "political unit," the Soviet side is prepared to seek a common language with them on specific international problems also. And the forms could be most varied here, what is more, including parliamentary ties, with those representing the European Parliament included.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France was a major landmark in the development of bilateral relations. The Soviet delegation came to Paris with the desire to impart to them powerful new impetus and raise them to a new level. The results of the negotiations permit the conclusion that this goal was achieved.

M.S. Gorbachev's conversations with F. Mitterrand and other French leaders testify that, following a certain interlude, Soviet-French top-level contacts are again acquiring their customary rhythm. Under the conditions of the present highly complex international situation such meetings, whether official or working, acquire particular significance. It was agreed to continue to build up the political dialogue. On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium M.S. Gorbachev invited French President F. Mitterrand to visit the Soviet Union. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

The sides noted with satisfaction that there had been a marked stimulation recently in consultations between the two countries' foreign policy departments, which today cover practically the whole spectrum of urgent international problems. A mutual desire to continue this practice, which has justified itself completely, and to enhance its fruitfulness, where possible, was expressed.

Parliamentary ties are an important channel of political communication in the modern world. Noting the significance of this form of contacts for strengthening mutual understanding between peoples, the Soviet side advanced the thought that members of parliament of different countries, representing different political currents and strata of society, are called upon to be exponents of the ideas of peace and cooperation and to strengthen feelings of friendship and respect between peoples.

During examination of the set of questions of trade-economic and scientific-technical ties both sides noted with satisfaction that these exchanges have been developing steadily in recent years. In the period from the start of the 1980's commodity turnover between our countries has been more than double the trade volume in the preceding 5-year period (1975-1979). The Soviet Union supplies France with natural gas and imports equipment for the gas and oil deposits. France, besides, sells the USSR pipes, chemical products and rolled ferrous metals and purchases from it certain types of machinery and equipment.

Of course, this difficulty or the other arises at times in the process of trade-economic cooperations. However, it is resolved, on the whole, by both sides' mutual efforts, as a rule. In the course of the visit F. Mitterrand noted with satisfaction that the first 6 months of 1985 testified to a restoration of equilibrium in the trade balance between the two countries.

At the same time the present level of trade-economic cooperation fails to correspond to existing possibilities. Proceeding from this, agreement was reached on a stimulation of the search in this area in order to impart greater enterprise to cooperation. A spirit of genuine innovation is essential here, as in other spheres. The demands of scientific-technical progress should be given priority. This would open new vistas for Soviet-French cooperation. It is important to seek new forms thereof more boldly and clear artificial obstacles from the path of the development of trade-economic exchange. Mutual benefit, conscientiousness in the fulfillment of commitments and conformity with the demands of the times form a dependable basis. The Agreement on Economic Cooperation Between the USSR and France for the Period 1986-1990, which was signed in the course of the visit, is intended to perform an appreciable role.

During discussion of the complex of bilateral relations great attention was paid to the development of scientific-technical relations. Considerable positive experience of cooperation has been accumulated in this sphere. It now encompasses more than 300 different subjects and fields, of tangible benefit to both states. The uniform opinion was expressed in the course of the negotiations that in the coming years cooperation in this sphere should be raised to a new height corresponding to the scientific potential of the USSR and France and the demands of the moment. The Soviet side proposed a study of the possibility and expediency of joint cooperation on the installation of an international "Tokamak" thermonuclear reactor to obtain energy on the basis of thermonuclear synthesis (scientists of the Soviet Union, France, the United States, Japan and a number of other countries participated in the elaboration of the project). An opportunity is afforded currently for the transition--based on the research which has been conducted--to specific steps to obtain a practically inexhaustible energy source. France reacted positively to this proposal.

M.S. Gorbachev's conversations with President F. Mitterrand and other of France's politicians and public figures and the agreements which were reached, the report on the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session issued on 11 October emphasized, have laid a sound foundation for the further development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and France and are of importance for strengthening European security, expanding all-European cooperation and improving the international situation. The major proposal put forward by the Soviet Union aimed at preventing the militarization of space, curbing the race in nuclear and other arms and developing fruitful international cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole have demonstrated convincingly our state's peace-loving foreign policy course.

The visit to France has been evaluated everywhere as a foreign policy act of exceptional importance creating a situation conducive to detente. The world community rightly saw the USSR's peace initiatives made public in Paris as the prologue of a possible turnabout in East-West relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CEMA DESCRIBED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 67-75

[Article by B. Gorizontov: "Transport and Socialist Economic Integration"]

[Text] Under current conditions the role of socialist integration as an important factor of the development of the CEMA countries' economy along an intensive path and the implementation of a resource-saving policy has grown appreciably. The rapid expansion of international scientific-technical and production cooperation has exacerbated the problem of overcoming distances. A number of new problems confront the transport serving the mutual economic relations of the socialist community countries in this connection.

I

Back at the dawn of Soviet power V.I. Lenin defined transport's external function as a material tool of relations with foreign countries.¹ In our time the intensive development of economic cooperation among CEMA countries has converted transport into a material implement of integration continuing the national production process in the international sphere of circulation. At the initial stage of integration transport was insufficiently adapted to the exercise of extensive and, what is most important, regular international economic relations. The location and technical provision of the arteries basically satisfied internal transportation requirements and contributed to foreign trade exchange in its customary understanding.

The existence of arteries of international significance is, as a rule, a stimulating factor of integration. Thus, for example, the use for navigation of the powerful water-transport artery --the River Danube--stimulated the economic development of the riparian territories. Large-scale industrial enterprises, which became a part of the integration system, were created here. Installation of the "Druzhba" oil pipeline led to the appearance of petrochemical complexes in Poland, the GDR, Hungary and the CSSR directly adjoining its route.

A new material product is not created upon the movement of commodities from one country to another, but transport increases its value for, as K. Marx wrote, the product may be used only when it has been delivered to the consumer.² The CEMA states expend a large amount of living and embodied labor on the

international transportation of commodities. Whence it follows that transport has an appreciable impact on the economic efficiency of integration measures.

The transport component actively influences the international specialization and cooperation of production. Where the value of additional transport expenditure exceeds the benefits derived from the international specialization and cooperation of production, the latter are inefficient. This fundamentally important proposition testifies to the need for the obligatory consideration of transport conditions when settling upon integration problems and measures. The experience of the CEMA countries' economic cooperation testifies that in a number of cases the transport factor has been taken into consideration insufficiently. Whence the excessive expenditure of living and embodied labor on the movement of commodities, raw material particularly.

K. Marx once formulated the proposition that all changes in the method of production lead to a change in general material conditions and that "precisely the revolution in the mode of production of industry and farming made necessary a revolution in the general conditions of the social process of production, that is, in the means of communication and transport."³ This proposition is completely corroborated by the practice of world development. Indeed, the scientific-technical revolution in industry has created the necessary conditions for the retooling of transport on a new, higher technical level. The simultaneous development and application of new methods of the transportation of commodities, as is occurring currently, is without historical parallel in transport.

High-speed freight trains frequently transporting just one commodity like coal or iron ore, for example, have appeared on the railroads. The merchant fleet is being reinforced with large-capacity, frequently specialized ships. Pipeline transportation is developing rapidly, and the diameter of the pipes and, consequently, their capacity are growing constantly; and the list of products transported with the help of pipelines is increasing. The quantity and quality of highways are growing appreciably, and various-purpose specialized trucks are appearing increasingly. A characteristic feature of aviation is the surging growth of the speeds and capacity of the aircraft. Scientific-technical progress is contributing to the development and introduction of efficient transport technology. Containerization, which increases transportation efficiency appreciably, is of particular significance.

Scientific-technical progress is contributing to the solution of a further important problem also--the economic development of new territories. There is an increase here in the efficiency of the international division of labor, which provides, inter alia, for a "reduction in time and space with the aid of means of communication and transport".⁴ New sources of raw material and energy sometimes located many thousands of kilometers from the consumers and on the territory of other countries are being put to use. Thus transport service created on a new technical basis is contributing to considerable changes in the location of the productive forces and acting as a powerful accelerator of the internationalization of economic life.

However, the feedback has to be borne in mind also. The transport infrastructure created on the new technical basis is influencing the entire course of economic development and international economic cooperation. It is

helping solve such global problems as the raw material, fuel-energy, food and other problems. The increased significance of transport for international economic cooperation is also directly connected with the fact that it is more international by nature: its rolling stock may in the majority of cases be operated successfully both in domestic and international service.

The CEMA countries encountered a number of difficulties in organizing the transport production line. Primarily communications in the border areas, that is, where new international commodity flows had emerged, were insufficiently developed. They had to be retooled and adapted to the changed conditions. In addition, as is known, international transportation within the confines of the socialist community is practiced over considerable distances. Even in the initial phase of the CEMA countries' integration the average distance of international railroad transportation constituted 1,200 kilometers (but only 400 kilometers in the EEC states).

The process of the movement of commodities is seriously complicated by the differences in the width of the railroad track (1,520 mm in the USSR, 1,435 mm in the European socialist countries). Interested countries have adopted a number of measures for the technical improvement of the railroad crossings located on the Soviet Union's western borders. However, many tens of millions of tons of the most diverse freight are still transshipped here. The load on arteries of international significance is growing annually, and many of them are operating at great strain.

Inasmuch as transport is designed to cater for the international transportation of an ever increasing quantity of diverse freight it is a priority sphere of the CEMA countries' cooperation. Integration processes have embraced practically all aspects of the development of transport. Planning activity, including the coordination of plans for international transportation and means of transport and also the long-term forecasting of the development of transport, the joint installation of facilities of international significance and the solution of economic and organizational questions, including the determination of basic wage rates for international transportation, have become most important areas of cooperation in this sphere.

To coordinate development the CEMA countries created special machinery in which the leading role belongs to the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in the Sphere of Transport. The commission undertakes plan coordination, the compilation of forecasts and the solution of comprehensive problems and elaborates ways of further improving individual forms of transport. The interested countries have built facilities of international significance--powerful oil and gas pipeline systems and a number of railroads in the border areas. Numerous international organizations for practically all forms of transport have been created and are operating successfully. These include the Common Freightcar Pool, which has more than 300,000 units.

In the new situation, when the socialist community countries are consistently pursuing a policy of the development of the economy along an intensive track, there is an appreciable increase in the role of integration as an accelerator

of the introduction of the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress. Whence the need for an extension of scientific-technical and production cooperation among CEMA countries. New problems arise in this connection, primarily the full rhythmicity and promptitude of the movement of products given their complete preservation on the route; the further retooling of the transport serving international shipments; and the extensive introduction in practice of new progressive technology.

II

Transport is an important component of the CEMA countries' economy. From 6 to 9 percent of the total number of employed persons works here, and from 7 to 15 percent of investments are allocated for its development. Transport's share of the national economy's fixed capital fluctuates from 10 to 15 percent. It is characterized by the rapid growth of freight turnover, which is directly connected with the countries' economic development and extension of the international socialist division of labor.

Table 1. Growth of the Freight Turnover of All Forms of the CEMA Countries' General Transport (1960=100)

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1983</u>
Bulgaria	526.3	847.4	847.4
Hungary	166.7	261.7	256.7
GDR	256.4	302.6	256.4
Poland	212.8	408.5	331.9
Romania	400	736	792
Soviet Union	204.1	326.5	349
Czechoslovakia	142.9	184.3	190

Source: "Statistical Yearbook of the CEMA Countries" for the corresponding years.

In 1960 the summary freight turnover of all forms of general transport of the socialist community countries constituted 2,071,000,000,000 ton-kilometers, but in 1983 some 7.22 trillion, that is, an increase of a factor of 3.5. This indicator grew particularly rapidly in Bulgaria and Romania, which was connected with the industrialization process which had occurred there. At the same time, however, there was a negligible increase in the said period in the network of railroads.

As can be seen from Table 2, there has been a comparatively small increase in the CEMA countries in railroads. The bulk of them has been built in the Soviet Union and is connected with the development of new areas and an improvement in the railroad network. Owing to the fact that a number of underused lines has been closed, the length of the railroads has declined in Hungary and the GDR. There has been no significant change in the overall length of exploited internal waterways. At the same time, however, there has been somewhat of an increase in the length of hard-surface highways. The oil pipeline system has been developed appreciably.

Table 2. Development of the CEMA Countries' Transport Network (Kilometers)

		<u>Forms of Transport</u>			
		<u>Railroad</u>	<u>River</u>	<u>Motor* (thousands of kilometers)</u>	<u>Pipeline</u>
Bulgaria	1960	4,111	470	27.4	-
	1983	4,278	470	32.8	622
Hungary	1960	10,041	1,556	27.3	385
	1983	7,869	1,622	29.1	2,174
GDR	1960	16,174	2,644	45.5	-
	1983	14,226	2,319	47.4	1,301
Poland	1960	26,904	3,708	104.4	-
	1983	27,139	3,875	152	1,984
Romania	1960	10,981	-	50.9	-
	1983	11,115	-	64	-
Soviet Union	1960	125,822	137,911	271	17,322
	1983	143,630	137,941	733	76,225
Czechoslovakia	1960	13,139	473	73.4	-
	1983	13,141	474	74.1	-

* Only hard-surface roads.

Source: "Statistical Yearbook of the CEMA Countries" for the corresponding years.

The big growth of commodity turnover has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the length of the means of communication. As a result there has been a considerable increase in the load on the operating means, particularly the railroads, which has led to a tremendous increase in their freight traffic. Thus a kilometer of Soviet railroad is used five times more intensively than the railroads in the United States and 7-10 times more intensively than in the industrially developed West European countries.

The transport of the CEMA countries, of the Soviet Union particularly,⁵ has for a long time developed along the path of concentration of transportation in certain of the most important directions (that is, along the path of arterialization). A strong and ramified system of trunk oil and gas pipelines has been created and is operating successfully in the USSR, and a number of main railroad lines provides for the shipment of the necessary freight between the country's most important industrial centers. The Soviet experience has been used by a number of other socialist states also. Thus, for example, the fully modernized main transport artery of Czechoslovakia (Cierna nad Tisou-Kosice-Zilina-Puchov-Prague-Plzen-Cheb) constitutes approximately 15 percent of the length of its railroads, but it caters for over 60 percent of freight and passenger transportation.

Use of the principle of arterialization helped the community countries assimilate new transportation given relatively small investments. And an appreciable proportion thereof, moreover, was spent on the technical reequipping of existing means. All this afforded a big savings of resources, but in a number of cases led to the exhaustion of traffic and carrying capacity potential and gave rise to certain disproportions, between the quantitative and qualitative state of the rolling stock and the development of transport lines, terminals, wharves and other fixed servicing facilities, for example; and between the growing tonnage of the merchant ships and the state of port complexes.

Uninterrupted transportation was disrupted and transport operated under great strain in certain periods in the community countries. The situation began to change for the better in the mid-1970's, when a number of measures was adopted and investments were increased, which entailed a growth of the fixed production capital and its replacement. Thus in Bulgaria transport fixed production capital commissioned in the period 1975-1982 increased 48 percent as a whole and 94.4 percent in railroad transport.⁶

Some R46.7 billion of transport fixed capital had been commissioned in the Soviet Union in 1971-1975, but R65.4 billion in 1976-1980. Transport fixed capital totaling R47.6 billion was commissioned in 3 years of the current 5-year plan alone.⁷ Big resources for its development have been allocated in recent years in a number of other countries of the community also.

The main task now is the rational use of the additional resources allocated for the needs of transport in order to bring it into line more rapidly with the requirements of the economy. Experience of the sector's development testifies that it is essential to pursue a consistent policy and constantly increase investments. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke about this with reference to transport at the CPSU Central Committee meeting on questions of an acceleration of scientific-technical progress: "At the present stage of the development of the economy problems of the production infrastructure have intensified. The lagging of transport, communications, material-technical supply and other sectors is leading to big losses. It is necessary to find additional opportunities for solving this acute national economic problem."

Transport costs in the CEMA countries are very substantial. In the Soviet Union, for example, costs pertaining merely to the sphere of circulation constitute almost R55 billion annually. More than 14 billion marks are spent annually in the GDR on internal freight shipments. Transport is a major energy consumer. Thus in Bulgaria Ministry of Transport enterprises account for approximately 20 percent of the gasoline, 46 percent of the diesel fuel and almost 10 percent of the electric power consumed in the country. In the GDR transport accounts for approximately 20 percent of the national economy's total consumption of energy, including approximately two-thirds of the liquid fuel. Improvement of its operation could make an appreciable contribution to the pursuit of resource-saving policy.

The changed energy situation required a fundamental revision of the transport development strategy and made appreciable adjustments to long-term forecasts. Paramount significance was attached to the indicator of the energy-intensiveness

of individual forms of transport. In the USSR, for example, unit consumption of standard fuel per 1,000 ton-kilometers in freight transportation constitutes approximately 9 kilos in railroad transport, 10 kilos in maritime transport, 11 in river transport, 149 in motor transport, 5.5 in oil pipeline and 52 kilos in gas pipeline transport.⁸ In the GDR the correlation per unit energy consumption by different forms of general transport given identical freight turnover constitutes 0.8 for water, 1 for railroad and 2.75 for motor transport.

In accordance with this, trends common for the majority of the European socialist countries have been discerned in the 1980's: the priority development of the least energy-intensive forms of transport--railroad, by way of an increase in the rate of electrification and the installation of a second track, and also maritime and river transport. The CEMA countries have scored certain successes in electrification of the railroads. At the start of the 1980's the total length of the world's electrified railroads constituted approximately 170,000 kilometers or 14 percent of the operational length. Of these, the socialist community accounted for 66,500 kilometers or 30.4 percent. Thus in terms of the proportion of electrified railroads the community countries surpass the average world indicator more than twofold.

Particularly significant successes have been scored in the USSR, where by the start of 1984 some 46,800 kilometers had been electrified, and the share of electric traction had risen to 58.9 percent. A large railroad ring 1,200 kilometers long was recently switched to electric traction in Bulgaria. It encircles the Balkan range along the Sofia-Ruse-Varna-Burgas-Plovdiv-Sofia route. In the current 5-year plan (1981-1985) it is planned electrifying 650-700 kilometers of railroad line. By 1990 it is contemplated having increased the length of the electrified lines to 3,000 kilometers. As a result more than 80 percent of the freight turnover of Bulgaria's railroad transport will be realized with the aid of electric traction.

Some 380 kilometers of railroad line were electrified in Hungary in 1981-1985, which provides for the electric traction of 57 percent of railroad freight turnover. By the year 2000 this proportion is to have risen to 80 percent. The electrification of the GDR's railroad is proceeding particularly rapidly in the current 5-year period: it will affect 826 kilometers. The Berlin-Rostock and Potsdam-Magdeburg railroads are being electrified with regard for the USSR's experience without a halt to train traffic.

Following a temporary reduction in the rate of railroad electrification in Poland, over 400 kilometers are once again being commissioned annually. In the period 1986-1990 it is planned electrifying 3,000 kilometers, which will make it possible to increase the electrified network to 12,000 kilometers. This will constitute over 50 percent of Polish railroads and increase the proportion of electric traction to 80 percent. The program for further electrification provides for an expansion of transport relations with the socialist community countries. Thus it is planned bringing the lines to several further points on the borders with the Soviet Union, the GDR and Czechoslovakia. By the year 2000 electrification is to have encompassed approximately 17,000 kilometers of Poland's railroad which will account for 90 percent of transportation.⁹ It is contemplated electrifying an additional 950 kilometers of the most freight-intensive lines by 1995 in the CSSR.

Motor transport, which is characterized by a large number of persons employed and considerable fuel consumption, is developing rapidly in all the CEMA countries. Under these conditions the rationalization of its work could produce big savings. Appreciable potential is contained in an improvement of the system of management. The point being that in practically all states of the community the motor transport under departmental jurisdiction has relatively low economic indicators.

In the USSR, for example, the productivity of the rolling stock of general motor transport is 1.7 times higher than departmental motor transport, and the prime costs of transportation are 30 percent lower on average.¹⁰ In Bulgaria the productivity of the rolling stock of departmental motor transport is 73 percent lower, transportation costs are 56 percent higher and energy consumption is 59.4 percent greater than in general motor transport.¹¹ The cost of transportation by departmental motor transport in the GDR is 47 percent higher, its load 33 percent lower and its per diem operation 25 percent less; per 1 million ton-kilometers of freight turnover it consumes 2.8 more tons of diesel fuel than general motor transport.

Available experience testifies that the level of labor productivity and transportation prime costs depend to a considerable extent on the size of the enterprises. Thus at large-scale general motor transport enterprises of the USSR labor productivity is 40-50 percent higher, while transportation prime costs are 20-25 percent lower than at small-scale enterprises. Whence the natural trend toward the creation of large-scale motor works and associations, which improves service of the clients appreciably, particularly under the conditions of work in accordance with the brigade-contract method. Whence also the aspiration to an improvement in the control of the work of motor transport thanks to its gradual transfer to the general system. In the GDR, for example, the task of raising transportation by general motor transport to 90 percent of total motor transportation in the next 5-year plan has been set.¹²

Rationalization of the structure of the motor pool will contribute to an improvement in work. This problem is particularly acute in the Soviet Union, where, owing to the shortage of small-capacity vehicles, small freight consignments are transported by heavy trucks. As a result operating losses amount annually to tens of millions of rubles. An improvement in the international specialization of (sic) the cooperation of the production of motor transport facilities within the CEMA framework will contribute to rationalization of the structure.

Road improvement--an inalienable component of the motor transport complex--will also contribute to a streamlining of the work. The quantity and quality of roads in the CEMA countries vary considerably. Thus the highway system of the GDR and the CSSR took shape comparatively long since and has a hard surface, and for this reason the main task is its modernization. A considerable number of roads predominantly with hard surface has been built recently in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Poland.

Large-scale construction has been under way in the USSR in recent years: the length of hard-surface highways increased from 270,800 kilometers in 1960 to 773,000 in 1983.¹³ Despite the pronounced successes in this sphere, the problem of roads remains very urgent, particularly for many agricultural areas. According to specialists' calculations, the total magnitude of harvest losses owing to the lack of roads is estimated at R4 billion annually.

According to data of the USSR Gosplan Institute of Comprehensive Transport Problems, ending the lack of roads situation in many parts of the country would make it possible to reduce the need for trucks by 600,000 and lower the national economy's motor transport costs by approximately R7 billion.¹⁴ Together with the building of major highways emphasis is being put on the installation of roads in rural localities, which will serve as an important condition of fulfillment of the Food Program.

The measures pertaining to an improvement in transport in the CEMA countries are bearing tangible fruit. As a result of the rationalization of transportation on the Soviet Union's railroads freight turnover declined by 150 billion ton-kilometers in the 10th Five-Year Plan, and expenditure on transportation thereby declined by more than R500 million. According to the plan for 1981-1985, it was planned thanks to the rationalization of transportation lowering the freight turnover of railroad transport by a further 160-170 billion ton-kilometers.¹⁵ Given an annual increase in the manufacture of products of 4-5 percent, freight transportation in the GDR declined 12 percent in 1981-1983 or by 122 million tons, while freight turnover declined 5 percent or by 3.3. billion ton-kilometers. General transport's consumption of diesel fuel declined 16 percent and of gasoline 42 percent. As a result unit expenditure declined 19 percent.¹⁶

The improvement of the national transport of the socialist community countries is affording new opportunities for the more intensive interaction of their transport systems under integration conditions. The further intensification of international cooperation in this sphere is particularly urgent.

III

The top-level CEMA economic conference in June 1984 adopted a decision on the implementation of concerted measures for the comprehensive development of mutual transport ties. They provide for the closer coordination of development plans, the coordination of capital investments in the transport infrastructure, the increased throughput of the border railroad stations and an improvement in the system of planning and the terms of the transportation of foreign trade freight by all forms of transport.

Particular attention is being paid to the closer coordination of plans for the development of transport--a method proved by long-standing practice which provides for an expansion of international transportation. What is new is that there will be an appreciable increase in the significance of the coordination of general transport policy and also investments. The socialist community countries are elaborating the principles of the organization of the interaction of the automated systems of control of the transport engaged in

international transportation. It is primarily a question of an interaction of national automated control systems (ASU) making it possible to appreciably improve plan coordination. The first experience of the use of ASU in coordination of the plans of international transportation and the development of means of transport for 1986-1990 has produced positive results. The current stage of the CEMA countries' cooperation is characterized by the ever increasing use of the programmed-goal approach. Thus the Long-Term Targeted Program of Cooperation for the Development of Transport Ties was elaborated within the framework of the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in the Transport Sphere. Its main goal is the quantitative and qualitative satisfaction of the CEMA countries' economically substantiated reciprocal freight and passenger transportation needs by way of the further concerted development of national transport systems and their closer interaction based on accomplished technical facilities and progressive technology. The program outlines the realization of a whole number of large-scale measures pertaining to an expansion of individual forms of transport up to 1990.

According to the program, the CEMA countries' main efforts in the sphere of railroad transport are being directed toward an increase in the efficiency of its operation and growing volumes of transportation in international traffic. This will be achieved by a buildup of the traffic and carrying capacity of the main lines, border stations and terminals given the extensive application of means of the comprehensive mechanization and automation of materials-handling operations.

Great attention is being paid to the modernization of the main railroad lines of international significance. Thus it is planned carrying out modernization and new construction on 14 railroad lines of the North-South direction and on a number of lines of the East-West direction. It is contemplated electrifying 7,300 kilometers of main lines here and reinforcing the border railroad stations and terminals.

The expansion and modernization of 22 sea ports and the construction of 3 new ones and also the expansion of 10 river ports on the Danube and 5 on the Elbe are envisaged in the sphere of water transport.

A program of modernization will contribute to the development of motor transport. Some 10,700 kilometers of roads, including more than 5,000 kilometers of superhighways, are to be modernized and built before 1990. Among these, four main routes with a total length of 8,800 kilometers are of paramount significance. Moscow-Berlin, Moscow-Sofia, Rostock-Constanta and Gdansk-Constanta. A number of the said steps is incorporated in the concerted plan of CEMA multilateral integration measures.

Perfecting cooperation in the transport sphere, the socialist community countries have stepped up attention to questions of the joint forecasting of the development of this sector. A particularly big contribution is being made by the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in the Transport Sphere. It has elaborated long-term--up to the year 2000--forecasts of the development of freight and passenger transportation in international traffic between CEMA countries; the further retooling of individual forms of transport; and the coverage of transport's need for basic technical means, materials and energy. There will be further structural changes in transport providing for the CEMA countries' reciprocal transportation (see Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of Freight Transportation in International Traffic Between CEMA Countries Per Form of Transport (%)

	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>
Railroad	89.3	87.9	66.1	44.9	43.9	44.1
Maritime	7.1	7.5	12.7	20.9	23.7	24.2
River	2.6	4.5	4.6	3.3	4.2	4.3
Pipeline	1	-	16.4	29.7	24.2	23.3
Motor	-	.1	.2	.3	.4	.5
Ferryboat	-	-	-	.9	3.6	3.6

Source: B.B. Gorizontov, "Socialist Economic Integration and Transport," Moscow, 1975, p 94; EKONOMICHSKOYE SOTRUDNICHESTVO STRAN-CHLENOV SEV No 8, 1984, p 40.

Upon the distribution of transportation among individual forms of transport account was taken of the most rational spheres of their application; the location of lines of international significance; intensification of the work of individual forms of transport, particularly with regard for the introduction of the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress; and the possibilities of economies in energy and materials.

The improvement of transport will largely depend on the successful solution of the problem of the replacement of the facilities, primarily the rolling stock, on a new technical basis. The extensive electrification of the railroads and the further growth of their traffic demand an increase in electric locomotive capacity to 5,000-6,000 kilowatts, and in the USSR to 12,000. The diesel locomotive fleet is being reinforced by new locomotives with a capacity of up to 3,000 kilowatts (per unit) for 1,435-mm-gage railroads and from 3,000 to 6,000 kilowatts for the 1,520-mm gage.

Consistent replacement of the freightcar fleet and a boosting of track facilities will make it possible to increase the weight of the freight trains on the railroads of the European CEMA countries to 4,000 tons and on individual routes in the USSR to 10,000 tons and more. The speed of the freight trains is to increase to 100-140 kph and of passenger trains to 120-160 kph and more.¹⁷

In water transport it is expedient to reinforce the fleet thanks to the manufacture of efficient types of ships, including specialized and multiple-function ships. Big tasks have to be tackled in respect of a further replacement of the truck fleet, predominantly with diesel engines, which ensure a substantial fuel saving. As the experience of the CEMA countries and world practice testifies, the main tasks of transport facilities under the new conditions are the increased efficiency of their operation; a reduction in the amount of energy and fuel consumed; and a lessening of the harmful impact on the environment.

Solution of the problem of new efficient, energy-saving means of transport will largely depend on a further extension of the international specialization and cooperation of their production. The CEMA countries have certain

experience here. Thus the GDR is specializing in the production of railroad passenger cars and certain types of sea-going and river ships, Hungary in the Ikarus buses and diesel passenger trains, Poland in freightcars and sea-going ships, the Soviet Union in trucks and aviation equipment and Czechoslovakia in electric locomotives. International cooperation in the production of means of transport, in the production, for example, of the Zhiguli automobile in Togliatti, in which 30 plants of the fraternal countries are participating, has been developed also.

And one further important question is the continued unitization and standardization of the facilities, which is becoming increasingly significant in connection with the rationalization of the work of transport on international routes. Recently the CEMA countries have been paying particular attention to the coordination of investments, in the sphere of transport included. A striking example of such coordination of the countries concerned is the installation of the new 4,605-kilometer Yamburg-USSR western border gas pipeline, whose commissioning is scheduled for 1989-1990. Its throughput could constitute 20-22 billion cubic meters a year. The new gas pipeline will cater for long-term and stable supplies of Soviet gas to the European socialist countries, which will make it possible to improve the structure of their energy balance and increase the proportion of oil used as raw material for chemical industry.

A trend toward unification within the CEMA framework of efforts for the creation and joint operation of efficient new technology has been manifested actively recently. Thus, for example, transport systems for international transportation with the help of maritime railroad ferries are being created. The Ilichevsk (USSR)-Varna (Bulgaria) railroad ferry crossing came on stream in 1978. Four maritime ferries, each of which accommodates 103 eight-wheeled railroad cars, are currently participating in freight shipments. In 1982 the volume of freight transported by the ferries constituted 3.4 million tons.

As a result of rationalization the full use cycle of the ferries has been cut from 72 to 60 hours. The crossing replaces 18-20 conventional-type ships and 16-18 mechanized wharves. The number of those employed has been cut by 3,500. The recovery time of investments in the ferry version constitutes 4 years compared with the 8.5 years in the ship version. A further increase in the capacity of the Ilichevsk-Varna crossing is scheduled. A similar crossing is being installed between Ruegen Island (GDR) and Klaypeda (USSR) in the Baltic. Over 5 million tons of freight will be transported here annually.

Six ferry vessels will be built at the (Matias Tezen) Dockyards in Wismar: 3 for the GDR, 3 for the USSR. The capacity of each will constitute 11,700 tons. Each of the two decks will accommodate 103 railroad cars, which will cover a distance of 506 kilometers in 20 hours--six times faster than by land.

The new tasks confronting transport under the conditions of the further extension of the CEMA countries' integration are being embodied in practice. Thus at its 113th meeting (January 1985) the CEMA Executive Committee examined a number of measures for an improvement in the work of transport directly ensuing from the directions of the top-level CEMA economic conference. Targets

pertaining to the development and upgrading of international lines and highways of international significance and sea ports, the expansion of freight shipments by "river-sea" ships, the creation by interested countries of a transporter barge system in the Baltic and also an extension of cooperation in civil aviation were determined.

The successful solution of transport problems insistently demands serious scientific developments and the unification of the scientists' efforts. The International Scientific-Technical Council was set up for this under the auspices of the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in the Transport Sphere within whose framework the problem of the scientific principles of the optimum functioning and interaction of the CEMA countries' transport systems for catering most fully for international transportation is being studied. Leading associates of head national institutes of the majority of CEMA countries are participating in the work. Scientific research is being concentrated in the most pertinent areas: methods of computation of the transport factor in the optimization of the international socialist division of labor; optimum outlines of international ties; priority directions of scientific-technical progress in individual forms of transport; forms and methods of the continued extension of cooperation; and others. As the studies are completed, the International Scientific-Technical Council issues recommendations, which are used in practice.

Improvement of the transport serving international transportation, particularly by way of the extensive introduction of the latest achievements of scientific-technical progress, will stimulate the further development of integration processes between CEMA countries and contribute to the increased economic efficiency of their mutual economic ties.

FOOTNOTES

1. See V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 44, p 302.
2. See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 24, p 170.
3. Ibid., vol 23, p 395.
4. Ibid., vol 16, p 128.
5. A specific feature of the USSR's powerful transport system is that large-scale new construction is under way together with the improvement of the operating network. It is connected with the economic assimilation of new areas, an increase in the maneuverability of the system, the installation of highways in rural localities and so forth.
6. ZHELEZOPTEN TRANSPORT No 3, 1984, p 6.
7. "The USSR National Economy in 1983," Moscow, 1984, p 348.
8. "Railroad Transport in the USSR and Abroad," Moscow, 1984, pp 18, 26.
9. TECHNICKA PRACE No 7, 1984, p 4.
10. V.Ye. Biryukov, "Transport in the 11th Five-Year Plan," Moscow, 1981, p 42.
11. PLANOVO STOPANSTVO No 7, 1984, p 66.
12. TECHNIK GEMEINSCHAFT No 2, 1984, p 9.
13. "The USSR National Economy in 1983," p 328.
14. VOPROSY EKONOMIKI No 3, 1980, p 10.
15. PLANOVOYE KHOZYAYSTVO No 10, 1984, p 99.
16. DDR-VERKEHR No 10, 1984, p 294.
17. EKONOMICHESKOYE SOTRUDNICHESTVO STRAN-CHLENOV SEV No 3, 1985, p 27.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

INTRACAPITALIST, EAST-WEST TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CHANNELS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 76-87

[Article by B. Dobrovinskiy: "Scientific-Technical Progress and the Formation of the Capitalist Knowhow Market"]

[Text] The problem of an enhancement of the economic role of science, which is acquiring ever increasing significance, is finding a productive solution in the practice of use of the results of scientific-technical activity not only in the countries where they are obtained but also outside. The achievement of bigger results is becoming the consequence of international scientific-technical exchange, which is practiced in two main forms. The first is the commercial form, which is characterized by relations arising between countries of buying-selling the results of scientific-technical activity either by way of their transfer in full or the sale of leasing rights for the temporary (partial also in a number of cases) use of patented inventions and also nonpatentable accumulated production skills and experience. The granting of so-called "engineering services" also is a variety of commercial relations in the exchange of skills.

The second--noncommercial--form of exchange arises as a result of the personal contact of figures of science and technology, the publication of scientific-technical information, inter-nation exhibitions and fairs, the dissemination of advertising material, the exchange of scientific-technical specialists, assistance (particularly along international organization lines) in the assimilation of scientific achievements and so forth.

Of the two basic forms of scientific-technical exchange, the greatest significance has been attached to relations built on a commercial basis. Of these, we should distinguish relations engendered by license trade, that is, by the sale by one side (the licensor) and the acquisition by the other (the licensee) of the rights conditioned by the license agreements to the use of patented inventions, trademarks, industrial samples and other types of industrial ownership, including the set of skills accumulated in the course of the production process and making it possible to organize the manufacture of the corresponding product elsewhere. The set of these skills, which have come to be called knowhow, is materialized in the form of planning records for the construction of enterprises and installations, descriptions of production engineering processes, outlines of the arrangement of machinery

and equipment and so forth. It is frequently not a subject of patenting. Nonetheless, knowhow is often the subject of license agreements.

Let us dwell on a study of license trade, which occupies the predominant place in the commercial exchange of scientific-technical skills. We proceed here from the fact that the theoretical propositions encompassing the financial-economic, legal, political and other aspects of license trade have already been illustrated in detail in a number of works of Soviet authors.* However, the factual data which they adduced encompass mainly the 1950's-1960's. Yet important new phenomena have arisen subsequently.

Formation of the License Market

Particular attention is attracted to the significant advance in the past two decades of license trade along the path of formation of an international market. This fact becomes obvious both upon an analysis of quantitative indicators and upon an examination of the specific features of this form of economic activity.

The said period has been marked by the rapid growth of the volume of license buying-selling transactions. The data merely for the six main capitalist countries show that in the latter half of the 1970's the volume of the sale of licenses grew in 1970 prices compared with the latter half of the preceding decade by a factor of 2.3, license purchases by a factor of 2.5 and the overall value of the deals by a factor of 2.4.** From 1975 through 1982 the sum total of transactions in the sphere of license trade constituted \$112.3 billion compared with approximately \$48 billion in the latter half of the 1960's.

The licensor which has far outpaced all other sellers of licenses has been the United States, followed, with a 7-9-fold lag, by Britain and Italy. Among the licensees, the most prominent places have been occupied by the FRG, Japan and Italy respectively (see Table 1). In economic literature these indicators have often been taken as criteria of an evaluation of the degree of scientific-technical independence of this country or the other. However, it should be considered that the data on the total volume of the foreign trade in licenses frequently conceal important singularities, like, for example, the fact that in Japan the predominant part thereof is made of payments for imports of and not the sale of licenses. Consequently, in this respect the degree of scientific-technical dependence on patent purchases abroad remains quite substantial.

* See, for example, I.D. Ivanov and Yu.A. Sergeyev, "Patents and Licenses in International Economic Relations," Moscow, 1966; V.I. Markushina, "International Scientific-Technical Relations in the System of Contemporary Capitalism," Moscow, 1972; "Economic Encyclopedia. Political Economy," vol 2, Moscow, 1975, pp 360-363; MEMO No 2, 1969, pp 26-37.

** Estimated from (KIKAY-NO KENKYU) No 7, 1981, pp 335-341.

Table 1. Total Value of the Sale and Purchases of Licenses by the Main Capitalist Countries (1975-1982)

	<u>Sales</u>		<u>Purchases</u>		<u>Sale-Purchase Total</u>	
	<u>\$, millions</u>	<u>average annual increase (%)</u>	<u>\$, millions</u>	<u>average annual increase (%)</u>	<u>\$, millions</u>	<u>average annual increase (%)</u>
United States	46,903	7.5	4,888	-3.5	51,791	6.6
Britain	7,481	9.2	5,839	7.5	13,320	7.6
Italy	5,214	18.4	8,292	12.2	13,506	14.3
FRG	3,705	8.7	8,919	4.2	12,624	4.4
Japan	2,528	21.3	9,726	14.3	12,254	15.7
France	2,799	10.2	6,013	8.4	8,812	9
Total	68,630	9.1	43,677	8.4	112,307	8.7

Estimated from "Balance of Payments Statistics," Part 1. IMF, Washington, 1983, p 190, 209, 285, 304, 626, 636.

If we switch from the absolute values to the rate of increase in the indicators of the foreign trade in licenses, the picture reflecting the position of individual countries proves quite different. The biggest increases in all indicators have been characteristic of Japan, followed by Italy and then (considerably further behind) by France, Britain and the United States. Thus in respect of license trade also Japan has achieved a rate enabling it to outpace other countries.

Further evidence of the fact that license trade is becoming firmly established as an independent market functioning alongside the commodity and capital markets may be provided by the fact that the rate of increase in the indicators of license deals throughout the two decades has invariably exceeded the rate of increase in commodity trade and the export of capital (see tables 2 and 3). This, we believe, is an essential feature of the development of capitalism in the latter half of the 20th century. The export of skills and experience is becoming an important factor of a strengthening of the domination of the highly developed capitalist countries and is an arena of acute competitive struggle and an important lever of the implantation of "technical imperialism" in the developing countries. This form of trade is growing particularly rapidly. As the data of Table 2 show, a preferential rate of increase in license trade in the 1970's is noted in all five of the countries in question.*

* If we take the period from 1960 through 1978, for Japan the rate of commodity exports is preferential compared with the export of licenses, but the situation was the opposite for this country also in the 1970's.

Table 2. Average Annual Rate of Increase of Exports and Imports of Commodities and Licenses (% , Based on 1970 Constant Prices)*

	<u>Exports</u>				<u>Imports</u>			
	<u>1960-1978</u>		<u>1970-1978</u>		<u>1960-1978</u>		<u>1970-1978</u>	
	<u>Commodities</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Commodities</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Commodities</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Commodities</u>	<u>Licenses</u>
United States	5.95	10	5.95	9.05	6.65	11.1	5.3	10.5
FRG	7.1	12.7	6.25	14.2	7.9	10.65	6.25	13.35
Japan	13.45	8.6	11.5	18.9	11.25	13.5	6.45	10.7
Britain	4.8	13.6	4.95	10.5	3.55	12.85	3.2	9.5
France	8.65	11.8	8.7	19.35	9.35	10.55	8.7	13.35

* Tables 2 and 3 were estimated with the participation of IMEMO associate I. Golubeva.

Estimated from BIKI, supplement No 6, 1981, pp 57-58; "National Accounts of OECD Countries. 1960-1977," vol II, OECD, Paris, 1979; "...1961-1978," vol II, OECD, Paris, 1980.

Comparisons of license trade with transactions on the monetary capital market are less indicative than with commodity trade inasmuch as international and national statistics do not adduce data on overseas capital investments computed in constant prices. It would not seem possible here, consequently, to entirely avoid the distorting impact of price dynamics of a varying character. Approximate calculations, however, show that the errors which arise are not so great as to fundamentally alter the picture which is obtained of the preferential increase in the rate of growth of the volume of license trade (see Table 3).

Table 3. Average Annual Rate of Increase of Direct Overseas Investments and the Volume of License Trade (% , Based on Current Prices)

	<u>Exports</u>				<u>Imports</u>			
	<u>1960-1978</u>		<u>1970-1978</u>		<u>1960-1978</u>		<u>1970-1978</u>	
	<u>Overseas investments</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Overseas investments</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Overseas investments</u>	<u>Licenses</u>	<u>Overseas investments</u>	<u>Licenses</u>
United States	9	11.4	9.8	12.2	19.6	12.5	23.45	13.65
FRG	19.85	14.1	19.4	17.45	11.65	12	12.8	16.6
Japan	20.8	24.95	26.75	22.3	1.6	14.95	-	12.2
Britain	11.85	15.5	18.95	13.65	11	14.3	13.95	12.6
France	10.95*	13.2	23.5	22.8	17.95*	11.95	21.35	16.6

* 1961-1978

Estimated from BIKI, supplement No 6, 1981, pp 56-57; "Balances of Payments of OECD Countries. 1960-1977," OECD, Paris, 1979; INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC INDICATORS, March 1983, pp 54-55.

In the 1960's-1970's* the volume of the foreign trade in licenses increased in all the said countries. However, a surplus balance of foreign license transactions took shape only for the United States and Britain. In Italy, the FRG, Japan and France payments for the acquired licenses were invariably greater than sales proceeds. However, the countries with a debit trade balance continued to persistently borrow the latest scientific-technical achievements and considered this profitable even under conditions where they themselves had scored significant successes in an expansion of national scientific-technical potential. They were not given pause either by considerations of a prestige nature or the additional expenditure of resources and the balance of payments problems arising in this connection.

In the years in question the United States continued to dominate the world license market. As can be seen from Table 4, the volume of its sales was six-seven times greater than the scale of transactions of the other countries. The United States took advantage of this to derive economic and political benefits, consolidate its positions in the system of the three centers of interimperialist rivalry, weaken trade competitors and implement a policy of the technological enslavement of the developing countries. However, the countries which were the United States' partner-rivals did not remain passive. The license market was just as competitive as any other. The 1970's were marked by a bitter struggle among the monopolies of the developed capitalist states to capture as large a part of the market as possible. As a result the monopoly associations of the FRG, France and Japan were able to put the squeeze on the American corporations both in respect of the entire volume of license deals and in terms of the export of licenses (see Table 5). In terms of the first of the said items the relative significance of the United States declined 11.6 percentage points, in terms of the second 13.2 points. Thanks to this there was an increase in the share of the market in the hands primarily of French and also British and West German capital. Thus the unevenness of different countries' buildup of their scientific-technical potential made itself felt, which served as a manifestation of the general law discovered by V.I. Lenin of the unevenness of the economic and political development of capitalism in the imperialist phase and the aspiration born of this to a redivision of the markets in accordance with the new alignment of forces which had taken shape.

* A similar situation continued in subsequent years also.

Table 4. Volume of License Transactions (\$, millions)

	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
United States									
Proceeds	4,323	4,376	4,717	5,822	6,202	6,976	7,316	7,142	7,867
Payments	473	482	434	610	757	768	720	198	448
Balance	3,850	3,894	4,283	5,212	5,445	6,208	6,596	6,944	7,419
Great Britain									
Proceeds	608	696	738	883	1,017	1,203	1,210	1,071	1,079
Payments	529	533	573	697	814	927	905	810	820
Balance	79	163	165	186	203	276	305	261	259
Italy									
Proceeds	322	388	454	537	696	808	953	1,049	1,001
Payments	725	617	809	938	1,016	1,222	1,345	1,611	1,650
Balance	-403	-229	-355	-401	-320	-414	-392	-562	-649
FRG									
Proceeds	316	312	350	463	543	612	543	563	587
Payments	826	808	992	1,177	1,370	1,445	1,180	1,115	1,186
Balance	-510	-496	-642	-714	-827	-833	-637	-552	-599
Japan									
Proceeds	146	173	210	275	323	351	484	563	566
Payments	692	797	1,004	1,164	1,266	1,328	1,710	1,755	1,977
Balance	-546	-624	-794	-889	-943	-977	-1,226	-1,192	-1,411
France									
Proceeds	191	193	279	346	423	496	494	375	587
Payments	516	587	543	679	804	1,028	946	905	912
Balance	-325	-394	-264	-333	-381	-532	-452	-530	-325

Estimated from "Balance of Payments Statistics," Part 1, IMF, Washington, 1984, pp 198, 217, 293, 312, 637, 647.

As license trade has expanded, particularly as of the first half of the 1970's, its economic significance has grown, which is confirmed primarily by the appreciable increase in the volume of license transactions. This could have happened only because the trade in scientific skills was economically profitable. The particular profitability of licensing is mentioned in literature repeatedly. Given the relatively small proportion of license transactions in total capitalist trade, they have produced up to 7 percent of the entire trading profit. The growth of the economic significance of license transactions is also confirmed by the multiplication effect to which they give rise of the manifold multiplication of the volumes of trade conducted overseas on the basis of the purchased licenses.

Table 5. Relative Significance of the Developed Capitalist Countries in the Foreign Trade in Licenses (%)

	Share of total license trade		Share of exports of licenses	
	Latter half of 1960's	Latter half of 1970's	Latter half of 1960's	Latter half of 1970's
United States	55.9	44.3	75.3	62.1
France	15	25.8	10.8	23.2
Japan	9.5	10.8	8.5	7.2
FRG	8.6	9.9	4	4.4
Britain	11	9.2	1.4	3.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Estimated from "Kagaku gidzyutsu khakuse" ("White Paper on Science and Technology"), Tokyo, 1981, pp 331, 332.

Specific Features of the License Market

As the license market expands, its singularities are making themselves known increasingly. In this connection it is necessary to turn once again to the specific nature of the subject of the market transactions itself.

As distinct from the commodity and money markets, in the license market the object of the deal is the right to use patented inventions or knowhow which has not become a subject of patenting. A special type of relations arises between buyer and seller not characteristic of either commodity trade or deals on the capital market. These are relations which, for example, permit the licensor not only to obtain rent stipulated by the contract but also to impose on the other contracting party contractual limitations in respect of the volume of production of the commodities, quotas and geographical limits of their sale, the specified time of the use of the license, the possibility of ceding rights to third parties and so forth. In turn, these relations envisage the emergence of a number of special privileges for the licensee. All the basic elements of the market mechanism--price, supply, demand--are formed here entirely differently from on the commodity and capital markets. The cause and effect and functional connections which take shape on the license market are highly specific. The notion concerning the existence of just two main world capitalist markets--commodity and money--should evidently be supplemented by recognition of the existence of yet another--the license--market, whose role under the conditions of accelerated scientific-technical progress is not only quite appreciable even now but which will in time grow increasingly.

Historically the license market is comparatively young. Although the practice of inter-nation license trade had become widespread on the eve and at the outset of the 20th century, its true development is usually related to the mid-1950's, when the scale of international license transactions began to exceed the dimensions of domestic license trade.

The market in question is distinguished by an exceptionally high degree of monopolization. The parties thereon are usually monopoly associations and state organizations, which imparts to the struggle in connection with prices and the terms of licensing a highly tense nature. This is the case particularly because the contracting parties in license transactions are the biggest firms possessing sufficient power to dictate their terms and the resources necessary to themselves undertake alternative research in the event of their finding this more profitable than the acquisition of licenses. The high degree of monopolization of license trade is inevitably leading to a significant proportion of the new and latest scientific-technical developments not making it to the sphere of international trade turnover at all. After all, the patent-holder corporations have no interest in sharing the market of a new, technically accomplished product with other monopolies and shun assistance to an uplift of the technical level of the enterprises of competing firms. In the 1960's the trend toward the erection of every conceivable obstacle in the way of rival firms' acquisition of licenses in which they were interested was not manifested that distinctly, but it had become more perceptible as of the mid-1970's, forcing the companies endeavoring to acquire licenses to make special efforts to identify the innovations of interest to them. Employing any means, as far as industrial espionage, they are endeavoring to identify new technology and acquire the corresponding licenses. Japanese firms maintain in the United States a staff of specialists of up to 1,500 persons and spend \$25-30 million annually to maintain them.*

The emergence in the arena of monopoly rivalry of the transnational corporations [TNC], marking profound changes in the methods of domination of the financial oligarchy and signifying an upsurge to a higher level of internationalization of capitalist production, has led to the creation of a largely new situation on the international license market also. The Czechoslovak Scientific-Technical Information Center, which made a special study of the TNC's role in the trade in techknowledge, concluded that the TNC have a decisive role in the international exchange of scientific-technical achievements. In 1978, according to data of the center, of the 59 percent of total income from international trade in scientific-technical achievements for which the United States, Britain and the FRG accounted, the amount which fell into the hands of overseas companies which are a part of TNC constituted 42 percent.

Up to 90 percent of the licenses sold in the capitalist countries belonged to the TNC at the start of the 1970's.**

* MEMO No 4, 1985, p 122.

** MEMO No 12, 1984, p 33.

A characteristic feature of TNC transactions on the international license market consists of the sale of licenses primarily to their daughter companies. It is interesting to note that this is not simply a free transfer but precisely a commercial deal with all its characteristic attributes, the establishment of quotas on the amounts of production and sales, determination of the profit-sharing norm, product sales markets and so forth.

The new policy which the TNC are employing in respect of the organization of R&D is contributing to a large extent to a strengthening of their positions on the license market. The Czechoslovak center observed that the TNC are increasingly transferring to other countries not only production capacity but also R&D. Thus in the period 1975-1979 the volume of R&D performed by the U.S. TNC in other countries grew from \$1.4 billion to \$2.7 billion. At the same time, however, foreign companies (mainly Dutch, Swiss and British) conducted R&D in the United States with a total value of \$900 million. The main purpose of their transfer to other countries consists of enlisting skilled personnel in R&D on terms favoring the TNC. There are certain differences in the approach to this problem by the American and West European TNC here. The American companies entrust to their overseas affiliates only a further refinement of a product which already exists, whereas the West European TNC afford them the opportunity of conducting research into and the development of entirely new products. As distinct from this, the Japanese TNC conduct such on the country's territory and do not transfer then abroad. As a rule, they are transferred to the developed countries and only as an exception to the developing states.

The practice of the transfer of a considerable proportion of R&D outside of the country where the TNC center is located, testifying to a departure from the trend which had been predominant earlier of the concentration of innovations at enterprises of one's own country, has contributed to the development of license trade in that it has facilitated for the licensees access to information about new scientific-technical achievements. While for the TNC, as mentioned, the expansion of this market has meant an increase in the bulk of derived profit for it has been proven that per unit expenditure the currency effect from the sale of new skills and technical novelties on the world market is far greater than from product exports.*

The 1974-1975 and 1980-1982 cyclical economic crises and the fuel-energy, raw material, food and currency-financial crises which accompanied them revealed the depth of the structural disproportions which had become characteristic of the world capitalist economy. There arose with all seriousness the task of a reorganization of the sectorial structure of the economy, a departure from reliance predominantly on material- and energy-consuming processes and a transition to the maximally intensive development of the highly science-intensive sectors and the use of energy- and material-saving technology, electronics and robotics. The significance of the efforts being exerted in a number of capitalist countries for the purpose of overcoming the structural crises had become obvious at the end of the 1970's even. And these efforts were not long in being reflected on the license market also, summoning forth appreciable changes in the sectorial structure of the trade in techknowledge. Whereas prior to the latter half of the 1970's the quest

* See IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK SSSR. SERIYA EKONOMICHESKAYA No 1, 1985, p 112.

for innovations and the conclusion of license agreements had been directed toward the development mainly of metallurgy, chemical industry, general machine building and textile production, currently they are being targeted increasingly at the satisfaction of the requirements primarily of the sectors which are at the forward edge of the structural reorganization of the economy (electronics, robotics, nuclear power engineering, production of new materials, technical optics, pharmaceuticals and others). It is natural that under these conditions the licensors, who are capable of offering for sale innovations enhancing the technical level of the progressive, nontraditional sectors, have found themselves in the most favorable position here. There are many examples to illustrate this. Here is one. Whereas the proportion of profits from the sale of licenses in the monopolies' total income from direct overseas investments constituted approximately 25 percent for the American TNC at the end of the 1970's, in the subsectors of electrical engineering and electronics production it was twice as much (57.5 percent).^{*} In this example it is a question of the licensor. However, it points to the purposefulness of the licensees' endeavors to secure priority in technology transfer for the structurally progressive sectors.

The period of the 1970's and the first half of the 1980's has been marked by an intensification of state regulation of license trade. State institutions act on the one hand as authorities stimulating this exchange and, on the other, as authorities limiting it. Thus the Japanese Government, endeavoring to promote the export of licenses for Japanese technology, prompted the most competitive sectors to pull themselves up in this respect to the level of ferrous metallurgy, where in a short time five companies had doubled the sale of licenses abroad and achieved in 1980 a surplus trade balance in this sphere of almost 8.5 billion yen.^{**} These recommendations were underpinned by the implementation of a number of incentive measures of a currency-financial nature.

The practice of stimulating the buying and selling of licenses and knowhow has been typical of governments of other capitalist countries also, primarily the more highly developed ones. It has been employed particularly often in the event of governments considering it expedient to authorize the sale to other countries of licenses for the production of military equipment. As the sovereign authority in this respect, states have been guided in their actions by political and military considerations to a greater extent even than by trade-economic considerations. This may be traced particularly distinctly in the example of Japan, whose government, in circumvention of constitutional restrictions, sanctioned the sale to the United States of licenses for the production of electronic equipment which could be used for military purposes.^{***} Similarly the U.S. Administration also has proceeded more from an endeavor to derive military-political benefits when it has assisted the sale to its NATO allies and Japan of licenses for the production of military equipment and arms.

In all the developed capitalist countries recent decades have been marked by a tightening of state control of the sale and purchase of licenses. There are

^{*} See "Transnational Corporations in World Development. Third Survey," United Nations, New York, 1983, p 385.

^{**} "State-Monopoly Regulation in Japan," Moscow, 1985, p 195.

^{***} Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone declared to a correspondent of the Italian newspaper LA STAMPA that he had given the go-ahead to the transfer of new technology to the United States which could be used for military purposes. This decision was made official by a document which was signed in February 1984 by Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe.

many known instances of the U.S. Commerce Department refusing to grant certain American companies permission to sell licenses if this has not been profitable from the viewpoint of the interests of the ruling class as a whole. To no less an extent than in the 1960's the Japanese Government currently regulates the dynamics, structure and terms of the conclusion of license agreements, being guided by the currency control act, in accordance with which a firm wishing to conclude an agreement with a foreign company must obtain permission from the appropriate government body. This situation exists despite the Japanese Government's extensively proclaimed assurances concerning the complete liberalization of license trade.

The governments of the capitalist countries are endeavoring to extend their regulating influence on license trade far beyond the bounds of national territory. U.S. President R. Reagan and Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone put forward the idea of the creation in the Pacific of an information network or center for highly intricate technology exchange. Clearly, this initiative pursues the goal of consolidating American and Japanese domination in the sphere of scientific-technical exchange.

Another example of such aspirations is the creation in the United States under the aegis of the government of a center for technology exchange between the United States and ASEAN, which unites a number of leading U.S. corporations and also private and government organizations of the association's countries. The purpose of this organization is to secure for American firms better terms of technology trade compared with Japanese and West European companies and to facilitate U.S. Government control of the export of licenses from the country.

The geography of license trade is also undergoing considerable changes. First, with the passage of time more and more states are being enlisted in the trade turnover. Second, and this is very important, license turnover is increasing predominantly between developed capitalist countries, on whose markets the bulk of the sold licenses is realized. Such a bias testifies to an intensification of the policy of technological neocolonialism and a deliberate aspiration to conserve the technical backwardness of the young national states.

A factor which has determined the dimensions and dynamics of license trade is the degree of activeness of patenting in the countries selling licenses. In this respect the 1970's were for the United States considerably less favorable than the preceding decade. If the average annual increase in exports of licenses by American monopolies was appreciably less than the increase in the volume of license trade of the five other leading capitalist countries (7.5 percent compared with 12.6 percent in the period from 1975 through 1982), this is explained to a considerable extent by the fact that the volume of patenting in the United States in this period diminished constantly by an average of 5.4 percent annually (72,000 patents in 1975, approximately 49,000 in 1979). In Japan, on the other hand, the total number of invention patents registered annually invariably increased, and this contributed to a considerable extent to the export of licenses from the said country increasing at a higher rate than from any other developed capitalist country.

Up to now it has been a question of factors which have contributed to this extent or the other to the development of scientific-technical exchange. However, together with them conditions have also made themselves known in the sphere of world license trade which have hindered the development of this exchange and impeded or at times altogether reduced to nothing the progress of this objectively inevitable, fundamentally progressive process. Among the latter, it is necessary to point primarily to the discriminatory policy of the capitalist states, primarily the United States, which they are pursuing in respect of the trade in licenses with the socialist community countries. The United States has turned license trade into an arena of the cold war to an even greater extent than commodity trade. Vainly attempting to thus hamper the economic development of the socialist countries, the United States and its NATO allies have imposed numerous prohibitions on the sale to the socialist states of licenses for many of the inventions which they have sold unhindered to other countries.

Appreciable barriers have also been erected by the developed capitalist countries in the way of the transfer of techknowledge to the developing states. This practice which is geared to preservation of the backwardness of the earlier enslaved peoples, has been condemned repeatedly in international forums, and its removal constitutes a condition of the creation of a new economic order in the world.

The hindering factors arose, however, not only as a consequence of the struggle of the two social systems in the world arena and not only by virtue of the imperialist states' aspiration to continue domination over the emergent peoples. They also appeared as the result of acute competitive struggle between capitalist firms. Far from everything that has been invented and patented circulates on the license market. The endeavor to outflank a competitor and prevent him appearing on the commodity market with new products frequently led to the competing firms being refused sale of the new technology, even if this entailed a loss of revenue. I. Davidson, international affairs correspondent of the British FINANCIAL TIMES, declared angrily that even now the Americans were piling up the subtlest obstacles in the way of the transfer of progressive technology to their West European allies. In turn, the latter frequently behave similarly in respect of one another, making the interests of their national monopolies the cornerstone primarily.

It needs to be added to what has been said that some of the skills and experience, bypassing market circulation, is conveyed to the military bloc allies either gratis or for negligible compensation. This applies primarily to the production of arms and combat equipment and has been most strikingly illustrated in the practice of mutual relations between the United States and the FRG and the United States and Japan since the war. Such transactions are not reflected in trade statistics.

As a whole, however, it should be emphasized that were it not for the artificially accumulated obstacles in the way of license exchange, its volume could be considerably in excess of the level that has been reached and its growth rate would be even higher.

The fact that the practice of an increase in the sale of the latest technology meets with the approval of far from all economists and business people also merits attention. Some of them are criticizing the TNC quite sharply for the fact that they are guided in their activity in this sphere by purely egotistic and momentary interests. Thus addressing a conference held in Paris by the Institute for Research and Information Pertaining to Transnational Corporations, (T. Odzava), professor of economics from a Colorado (United States) university and World Bank and OECD consultant, roundly condemned a number of American companies, accusing them of trading away advanced national technology. He also condemned them for the fact that they were contributing in transferring the latest technology to their daughter affiliates overseas to increased competition on the part of the monopolies of other countries. Such actions, (Odzava) emphasized, although enabling the TNC to derive short-term benefits, caused a deterioration in the competitive positions of American industry as a whole.

In speaking of the singularities of license trade in recent decades it should be mentioned that the sale of skills has been faced more in this period than before with the expanded noncommercial exchange thereof at the time of international congresses, conferences, symposia and colloquiums, in the process of the holding of international exhibitions, fairs and specialized equipment demonstrations, as a result of the inter-nation exchange of scientific-technical literature, as a consequence of the granting of technical assistance on a noncommercial basis, along international organization lines included, and so forth.

A further specific feature of the development of license trade has appeared in greater relief. I refer to the fact that the monopolies of the developed capitalist states have to a considerable extent lost the opportunity of imposing fettering terms of the sale of licenses on the developing countries since these countries have gained access to the scientific-technical assistance of the socialist states, which is rendered them on the most favorable terms possible.

The acceleration of scientific-technical progress has had as an important consequence the development of license transactions on a scale and at a pace which have led right to the point of the conclusive formation of a specific license market distinguished in terms of its characteristics from the markets of the foreign trade in goods and services and also monetary capital. The formation of this market has been a manifestation of the aspiration innately inherent in capitalism to an unlimited expansion of the sphere of its activity and the transference of activity to increasingly new spheres. It has reflected to a certain extent the objectively conditioned, but spontaneous process of the internationalization of the economic life of the capitalist countries, the extension of the cooperation and specialization of production and the creation of the prerequisites for an intensification of integration processes and the dissemination of scientific-technical experience.

The rate of development of license exchange has outpaced the growth rate of commodity trade and the export of monetary capital, which has reflected the objective need for and productiveness of the borrowing and application on national soil of the scientific-technical achievements of other countries.

The acquisition of licenses for foreign inventions and technical experience has been regarded as an important factor conducive to the contemporary reorganization of the structure of the economy in respect of the demands of the scientific-technical revolution.

The license market, like any other capitalist market, has become an arena of bitter competitive struggle between the three power centers. The shares thereon of different countries have been redistributed in accordance with the positions they have won in the field of the creation of new and the latest technology.

At the same time the license market has shown itself to be a most monopolized and discriminatory market used by the industrially developed countries in the interests of realization of the policy of technical neocolonialism. Licenses have been traded mainly between the leading capitalist states. The forces which are predominant in this market have endeavored to keep the developing countries on the sidelines of scientific-technical exchange in order to thus preserve their technical backwardness.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

DECLARATION OF NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE IN SOUTH PACIFIC APPLAUDED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85
pp 99-106

[Article by V. Amirov and Yu. Belokon: "Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific"]

[Text] A new phenomenon in the international-political life of the Pacific--the strengthening movement for the creation in the South Pacific of a zone free of nuclear weapons--has been calling increasingly great attention to itself recently.

The decision concerning the formation of such a zone was adopted on 6 August 1985 at the 16th session of the South Pacific Forum in Avarua, the administrative center of the Cook Islands (Rarotonga Island).^{*} The event, which occurred in a remote part of the planet, on a tiny island lost amid vast ocean expanses, has had extensive repercussions throughout the world. And this is not fortuitous inasmuch as it concerns the most burning topic of the present day--the problem of an end to the arms race and elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

There is now an increasingly perceived need that energetic work to curb the arms race be performed in all directions. An important place here is occupied, as before, by measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in reply to an appeal of the Japanese Council of Organizations of Victims of the Atomic Bombings, "our country treats with understanding the endeavor of many states to create nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world. We support the creation of such zones in, for example, North Europe, the Balkans, in Southeast Asia and in Africa. The efforts of states of the South Pacific to create a nuclear-free zone in this region merit approval."^{**}

^{*} As is known, currently the world's sole nuclear-free zone, which is enshrined in international-law form in accordance with the "Tlatelolco Treaty" (which was signed in 1967 and which came into force in 1969), is Latin America. In addition, a de facto nuclear-free zone is Antarctica, where a corresponding international treaty (signed in 1959, came into force in 1961) prohibits any military activity at all and stipulates specially, furthermore, that all nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive material in this region are banned. The treaty's provisions apply to the area south of Latitude 60 degrees South, including shelf glaciers.

^{**}PRAVDA, 6 August 1985.

The participants in the session of the Socialist International Bureau in mid-October 1985 in Vienna supported the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific region.

The territory encompassed by the nuclear-free zone being created in the Pacific is impressive primarily for its dimensions. According to the description provided in Appendix I to the "Avarua Treaty" and the sketch map appended thereto, the zone is described by a line starting at the point of intersection of the equator and the northern maritime frontier between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea. It then runs eastward basically along the equator, with the exception of certain sectors, where it runs somewhat to the north of it (as far as Latitude 5 degrees 30 minutes North). The eastern boundary is the 115th meridian of Longitude West, while the southern boundary is the 60th parallel. In the West the line of the zone runs initially along the 115th meridian of Longitude East and then along the outer frontier of the territorial waters of Australia and the maritime and land frontier between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, thus closing the perimeter of the zone. The latter includes also the islands in the Indian Ocean belonging to Australia.

The following facts also provide an idea of the scale of the nuclear-free zone. Although the total population of the countries which are incorporated in the South Pacific Forum is small (less than 24 million), the aggregate dimensions of the territory they occupy constitute approximately 8.5 million square kilometers. The area of their 200-mile economic zones is truly vast (for example, for Australia it constitutes 6.4 million square kilometers, for Papua New Guinea 3.1 million square kilometers).

I

To understand the essence of what occurred on 6 August in Avarua a retrospective glance at the development of events in this region in recent decades is appropriate. First, concerning the body which made the decision. The South Pacific Forum is a regional organization which has been in existence since 1971. The leading part in its creation was played by Australia, which has the biggest political and economic influence in the region. Originally the forum was made up of 6 states and 1 self-governing territory. In line with the development of the decolonization process, which has been stepped up particularly here since the mid-1970's, the number of its participants has reached 13. They include, besides Australia, one other developed capitalist country--New Zealand--9 independent developing states--Vanuatu, Western Samoa, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Fiji and also Niue and the Cook Islands, which have the status of self-governing territories in "free association" with New Zealand.

Since the time of the emergence of the South Pacific Forum its participants have proclaimed as their main goal the establishment of mutual economic cooperation. However, with time--particularly in recent years--increasingly great significance has come to be attached to interaction in questions of foreign policy also. The set of problems connected with nuclear weapons, the nuclear threat, the conducting of nuclear explosions here and their consequences is moving to the forefront here.

There have been and continue to be particular reasons for a kind of "nuclear allergy" on the part of the peoples of the region. The point being that practically throughout the postwar period it has served and continues to serve as the most important and, it may be said, sole nuclear firing range of its kind of the Western powers. Thus the United States carried out nuclear explosions from 1946 through 1963 on a number of atolls of the Marshall Islands, which are situated north of Nauru and Kiribati. Australia's Victoria Desert was the site of British atomic weapon tests in the 1950's and 1960's. Instances of the secret burial in the former testing area of Maralinga of the British atomic industry's radioactive waste were revealed recently. The United States and Great Britain were "relieved," as it were, by France. After Algeria had won independence, it transferred its nuclear testing center from the Sahara to Eastern Oceania. More than 100 nuclear explosions, including 45 in the atmosphere (up to 1975), have been conducted here, in Polynesia, which since 1958 has had the status of "overseas territory," on the Mururoa (the main testing site) and Fangatau atolls from 1966 through 1985. Approximately eight tests are now conducted annually. As a whole, according to foreign press reports, the Western powers have exploded over 250 atomic and hydrogen bombs in the Pacific, which has done tremendous damage to the population and environment of the areas adjacent to the test sites.

But for the countries and peoples of the South Pacific there are other aspects of the nuclear problem also. They are connected primarily with the Pentagon's assertive activity in the region, the scale of which is growing constantly. The ocean waters are being plied by American ships with nuclear weapons on board. In a number of states of the forum the U.S. armed forces have the opportunity to use airfields, ports and other installations, not to mention the presence of large American military bases on Australian territory. Important military and naval facilities of the Pentagon are located in neighboring Micronesia, where nuclear and chemical weapons are stored and there are firing ranges for testing ICBM's. Reports have appeared concerning the existence in a number of Western states of plans to dispose of and bury radioactive waste (spent nuclear power station fuel, in particular) in certain parts of the Pacific (in the Marianas, for example).

Thus there are more than enough factors engendering antinuclear sentiments and movements in this region. At the same time circumstances of another kind have to be taken into consideration also. It is primarily a question of considerable--and in some cases huge--differences in the economic and political position of the Pacific Forum members and, correspondingly, their far from equal role in the affairs of the region. All this gives rise to differences in their positions in respect of the nuclear problem as a whole and individual aspects thereof. Furthermore, the very essence of the problem has undergone considerable change. Whereas initially its seriousness was determined mainly by the conducting of nuclear weapons tests, in time the significance of other aspects began to grow also. Thus a new factor appeared stimulating antinuclear sentiments and exerting an increasingly big influence on the policy of the governments--the broad public movement in support of the deliverance of the region from nuclear weapons. And, finally, compared with the period of 10-15 years ago, when the decisive part in questions of the determination of nuclear policy here was played by Australia (and also New Zealand), now the voices of the region's young developing states are ringing out increasingly loudly.

The way to the decision on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific proved difficult and for this reason quite long. The idea itself was advanced for the first time officially in 1973. A number of factors contributed to this. Among these were primarily the assumption of office in Australia and New Zealand of the Labor parties, in which (particularly among the ordinary members) antinuclear sentiments had begun to spread markedly. And, of course, the trend toward the relaxation of international tensions, which acquired considerable impetus at the start of the 1970's, could not have failed to have been reflected in the political situation in the region.

The first to present the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone was New Zealand (its position on this issue is at the present time also more consistent than many other countries of the forum). Two years later, in 1975, this initiative was supported, although not without hesitation, by Australia, which voted at the UN General Assembly 30th Session in support of the corresponding proposal, which had been submitted by New Zealand in conjunction with Papua New Guinea and Fiji. The point was that the existence of large reserves of uranium and developed scientific-technical and industrial potential was prompting a certain section of Australia's ruling circles to think about the possibility of the creation in the future of its own nuclear weapons.* There were--and continue to be--serious internal political disagreements on the question of uranium production in the country. They are also occurring in the Labor Party itself, whose left wing supports a total ban on the mining and export of uranium. But the main factor, perhaps, countering the trend in favor of support for the idea of a nuclear-free zone were Australian-American military-political relations--both bilateral and along ANZUS bloc lines.

At the same time, however, Canberra began also to take into consideration increasingly the essential benefits which it would derive from support for the idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone. It was assumed there that this would underpin Australia's claims to the role of a kind of "regional leader" (from the angle of interimperialist rivalry with France, which owns here, besides Polynesia, other "overseas territories" also, included) and markedly increase its political influence. Hopes for a broadening of the possibilities of foreign policy maneuvering beyond the confines of Oceania also (in relations with the developing states included) were also bound up with this. In short, Canberra's policy in the nuclear field was determined from the angle of the search for ways and means of enhancing the country's role and place in world politics.

Conservative parties returned to office in Australia and New Zealand in 1975, which pushed aside the problems of a nuclear-free zone. Thus the New Zealand Government once again permitted calls at the country's ports of American ships with nuclear weapons on board, while the Australian Government lifted in 1976 the ban on calls of nuclear-powered warships which had been in effect since 1972. The subsequent years of conservative rule were characterized as a whole by a

* While having signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1969, Australia ratified it only in 1973.

strengthening of the two countries' military-political relations with the United States within the ANZUS framework, while the proposals connected with a limitation of nuclear activity in the region were reflected merely in documents of the opposition parties.

The idea of the creation of a nuclear-free zone acquired new impetus with the assumption of office in Australia in March 1983 of the Labor government headed by R. Hawke. In 1982 the party conference had determined its platform on this problem. It condemned nuclear explosions and the disposal of nuclear waste in the ocean and demanded an end to "all kinds of nuclear activity" in the South Pacific. The prevention of calls at Australian ports of warships carrying nuclear weapons was envisaged.*

The question of the creation of a nuclear-free zone became an important element of the policy of the R. Hawke government. The right-of-center leadership of the Labor Party connected with support for this idea hopes for a strengthening of its domestic policy positions, hoping that this, in particular, would help neutralize the demands of the party's left wing, which occupies a more radical position on various aspects of the nuclear problem, and "curb" the growing antiwar movements in the country. In the foreign policy plane Canberra, having taken the initiative in the creation of a nuclear-free zone, endeavored to direct into a certain channel the antiwar activeness of the young states of Oceania threatening the positions of imperialism in this region and to strengthen its authority in the South Pacific Forum. Simultaneously the R. Hawke government hoped to expand the field of diplomatic maneuvering (primarily in relations with France and the United States) and thereby impart to its foreign policy greater dynamism within the framework of the entire Asia-Pacific region.

The possibilities of negotiations of the countries of the South Pacific subregion concerning the creation within its confines of a nuclear-free zone increased with the assumption of office in New Zealand in July 1984 of the Labor Party. The ban imposed by the D. Lange government on calls at the country's ports of ships with nuclear weapons on board and nuclear-powered ships served as the catalyst for a further growth of antinuclear sentiments in the states of the South Pacific Forum. Its 15th session, which was held in August 1984 in Funafuti (Tuvalu), determined the general provisions of the status of the future nuclear-free zone and adopted the decision to prepare a draft of the corresponding treaty for the next session, for which a working group headed by the Australian representative was set up.

The draft treaty was drawn up in an atmosphere of the intensified struggle of various political and social forces in the subregion around the problem of nuclear disarmament. Of course, outside pressure, primarily on the part of Washington, which is stubbornly insisting that the D. Lange government cancel its decision, was reflected also. The profound crack which has appeared in ANZUS has seriously troubled the Australian Government. Despite the readiness which is displayed constantly to support the general foreign policy line of the United

* In February 1984 the Labor Government, following consultations with the United States and Great Britain, abandoned further compliance with this provision of the election platform.

States, on this question it evidently did not consider it advisable to put too strong pressure on New Zealand. In addition, the antiwar, antinuclear movement had strengthened in the country itself. The pronounced success at the December 1984 parliamentary elections of the Nuclear Disarmament Party, which had been formed only 18 months prior to then, testified, in particular, to its stimulation. The fall (according to the Australian calendar) antiwar marches acquired in 1985 a mass character. Thus, according to press estimates, approximately 400,000 persons took to the streets on 31 March in all the main and the majority of the peripheral cities of the country. Over 8.5 million of the country's inhabitants are living in cities and districts which their municipalities have declared nuclear-free zones.

As we can see, the interweaving of a whole number of factors--of both a foreign and domestic policy nature--determined the basic motives which conditioned the interest of both Australia and New Zealand (despite the differences, considerable at times, moreover, in their positions) in the speediest adoption of a decision on the creation of a nuclear-free zone. But this interest also prompted them to make efforts to reduce to a common denominator the very different opinions of and approaches to this issue of the developing countries of Oceania. Ultimately, the document prepared by the working group and approved in Avarua recorded the basic principles preliminarily determined by the states of the forum in 1984 at its session in Funafuti.

III

The preamble to the Treaty on the Creation in the South Pacific of a Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons proclaims the allegiance of its signatory states to the cause of peace throughout the world; it expresses their serious concern at the continuing arms race, which is leading to the "risk of nuclear war with its devastating consequences for all mankind," as, equally, the belief that "all countries are obliged to make every effort for the achievement of the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons" and the removal of the threat which they represent for mankind and life on Earth; expresses the confidence that "regional arms control measures could contribute to global efforts for a turning back of the nuclear arms race and promote the national security of each country of this region" and general security for all; and confirms once again "the importance of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons for preventing the spread of such weapons and promoting international security".

The communique adopted on the results of the Avarua session observes that "the signing of the Treaty on a Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific...reflects the profound concern of all members of the forum at the continuing nuclear arms race and the risk of nuclear war". The resumption of the Soviet-American Geneva negotiations is welcomed in this context and the hope expressed that these negotiations "achieve their stated goal--both a reduction in nuclear arms as far as their final liquidation and the prevention of an arms race in space".

The basic provisions of the treaty are recorded in articles 3 through 7.

Thus article 3 proclaims a renunciation of nuclear explosive devices. The subscriber-countries undertake here: "a) not to produce or acquire and not to

possess or have control over any nuclear explosive device by any means anywhere-- within or beyond the confines of the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific; b) not to endeavor to obtain or obtain any assistance in the production or acquisition of any nuclear explosive device; c) not to engage in any actions to assist or encourage the production or acquisition of any nuclear explosive device by any state".

Article 4 concerns the peaceful aspects of nuclear activity. In particular, the subscriber-countries undertake to supply fissionable material for the use for peaceful purposes to any nonnuclear state only in accordance with the safeguards provided for by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and to any nuclear power only in accordance with safeguards agreements with the IAEA.

Article 5 contains an undertaking to prevent the deployment on one's territory of nuclear explosive devices. However, "each subscriber, by way of the exercise of its sovereign rights, is free to decide whether to permit visits of foreign ships and aircraft to its ports and airfields and the crossing of its airspace by aircraft and the navigation of foreign ships in its territorial waters...".

Article 65 undertakes "to prevent the testing of any nuclear explosive device on its territory" and "not to engage in any actions to assist or encourage tests of any nuclear explosive device by any state".

Finally, article 7 contains an undertaking "not to dispose of radioactive waste and other radioactive substances in the sea anywhere within the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific" and not to help or encourage anyone to such actions; "to prevent the disposal of radioactive waste and other radioactive substances by anyone in one's territorial waters"; and to support the conclusion as quickly as possible of a convention concerning protection of the natural resources and environment in the South Pacific region and a protocol thereto on the prevention of the pollution of this area by way of the disposal in the sea of radioactive substances.

The creation of a system of control of compliance with the provisions of the treaty, an exchange of information, consultations within the framework of a consultative committee established for these purposes and so forth are provided for. The treaty is to be ratified by each subscriber-country. It is of an indefinite nature and will take effect from the time its instruments of ratification are deposited. The depository is the director of the South Pacific Office of Economic Cooperation, which is the main executive authority of the South Pacific Forum.

The treaty was signed in Avarua by the heads of government of eight states and territories (Australia, Western Samoa, Kiribati, Niue, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Tuvalu and Fiji). Concerning the other participants in the forum, the communique on the results of the session noted understanding of the fact that they could not sign the treaty until the appropriate constitutional procedures were observed.

Of course, the laws of each country have their singularities. But it is obviously not only a question of this. There are also purely political reasons

engendered by the nature of the document adopted at the Avarua session and the varying attitude thereto on the part of states of the region.

The greatest attention is attracted in this connection by article 5 of the treaty, whose content was spoken of above. After all, it may also be interpreted in the sense that it affords foreign states, nuclear included, an opportunity to use ports, airfields and similar installations on the territory of countries of the region. And primarily the United States and also Great Britain could avail themselves, as, incidentally, they are already availing themselves, of this opportunity. As far as France is concerned, its military activity is concentrated on its "overseas territories".

Those who insisted on the incorporation in the treaty of article 5 are attempting to justify their position by the need for respect for and compliance with international law in the part thereof concerning freedom of navigation and aeronautics. Such an intention can only be welcomed, which cannot be said of the difference in interpretation of this freedom. Thus the desire of the USSR--within the framework of the development of mutually profitable economic relations--to conclude fishing agreements with certain island states of Oceania is immediately presented by imperialist circles as an example of "Soviet expansionism" and some kind of "threat" to the countries of the region.

At the same time, however, the regular visits by American missile-carrying submarines of the Cockburn Sound (west coast of Australia) base are considered as "going without saying". B-52 strategic bombers have an opportunity when making flights over the Indian Ocean to land at the Australian air base in Darwin (in the north of the continent), at which the United States permanently keeps service personnel. Major American communications, tracking and guidance stations (North West Cape, Pine Gap and [Narrangara]), which play an important part in supporting the functioning of the nuclear-space component of the United States' military machine, are located on Australian territory. All this compels special attention to the provisions of articles 3 and 5 of the treaty, which speak of renunciation of the possession and prevention of the deployment on one's territory of nuclear explosive devices, but do not say one word about their delivery systems (among which, for example, are those same B-52 bombers, missiles installed on submarines and so forth).

IV

Granted all the complexities connected with the formulation of the "Avarua Treaty," complexities engendered to a considerable extent by disagreements between participants in the South Pacific Forum, and granted the existence of the barriers which still have to be overcome in the way of implementation of the provisions recorded in the treaty, the decision adopted on Rarotonga Island contains a considerable positive charge.

In the subregional plane the "treaty setting" of antinuclear sentiments at interstate level could serve as a stimulus to their further spread among the broad public and active introduction in the foreign policy of the governments of the forum's countries as an important element thereof. States which both

signed the "Avarua Treaty"* and which have not signed it, but which support certain of its provisions have acquired an instrument of collective influence on the policy of the leading imperialist powers in this part of the world. The document in question will contribute to growth of international-political self-awareness in the young ocean states.

It should be mentioned particularly that the "Avarua Treaty" goes beyond the subregional framework--it is of significance for the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. Thus a number of its provisions is consonant with the antinuclear demands of the peoples of Micronesia,** whose relations with countries of the South Pacific Forum have enjoyed certain development in recent years (it has observer status in this organization). An active antinuclear position is occupied by a part of Micronesia--the Republic of Belau.

At the UN General Assembly special session held on 16 October 1985 devoted to the decolonization process a collective statement made by a group of East European socialist countries observed, in particular: "The policy of the dismemberment of Micronesia, the conversion of which into a U.S. military base is contrary to the aspiration of the Pacific states to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, is causing serious concern."

The initiative of the South Pacific countries has also revived interest in the problem of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. And here also the main obstacle to the realization of this idea is the policy of imperialism, American primarily, and its close military-political relations with a number of ASEAN countries. In particular, on the territory of the Philippines there are, inter alia, two bases of strategic significance which are the Pentagon's biggest military facilities outside of the United States--the Subic Bay naval base and the Clark Field air base. Washington is endeavoring by might and main to preserve and strengthen its military presence in Southeast Asia. It is attempting for this purpose, in particular, to impede the establishment of constructive dialogue between the Indochina countries and the ASEAN states. Given the absence of such a dialogue, it is easier for the United States to counteract the conversion of Southeast Asia into a zone of lasting peace, stability, good-neighborliness and cooperation. Serious concern was caused in Washington by the fact that in the wake of the adoption in 1984 at the 15th session of the South Pacific Forum of a decision in principle on the creation of a nuclear-free zone ASEAN returned once again to discussion of the question of the establishment of such a zone in its subregion. Although it is as yet too

* Papua New Guinea subscribed to it on 16 September 1985--the 10th anniversary of the proclamation of its independence.

**Since 1947 it has been a UN trust territory administered by the United States. The latter, in violation of the UN Charter, had split Micronesia by the start of the 1980's into four formations: the Community of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Belau (Palau archipelago) and the Federated States of Micronesia (the Central and East Carolines and a number of other islands).

early to speak of any pronounced practical actions in this field, the "Avarua Treaty" could undoubtedly perform a certain stimulating role here. Indonesian Foreign Minister M. Kusumatmaadja declared, in particular, that the antinuclear treaty concluded by the participants in the forum serves "as an expression of the Pacific countries' firm position on this question."

The movement for the creation of a nuclear-free zone is having a positive impact on the South Pacific states' position on problems of peace and disarmament as a whole, and not only at the regional level. Thus Australian Foreign Minister W. Hayden, welcoming the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons announced by the Soviet Union, called for a mutually agreed renunciation of testing and emphasized that there was no alternative to a treaty prohibiting nuclear tests which was all-embracing and subject to verification.

The Australian Government has declined to support President R. Reagan's "strategic defense initiative". We believe, W. Hayden declared, addressing the UN General Assembly 40th Session, that the maximum attention should be paid to the mobilization of efforts to ensure that space be used solely for peaceful purposes. Support for actions aimed at an end to the nuclear arms race was also reflected in the speeches delivered from the UN rostrum by the representatives of New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, Western Samoa and other participants in the South Pacific forum.

The movement for the creation of nuclear-free zones, which has encompassed various parts of the world, is contributing to the development of the political cooperation of the states which support this idea. The political contacts between New Zealand and Sweden may be cited as an example. Back at the end of the 1970's the latter, as is known, banned calls in its territorial waters of warships with nuclear weapons on board and actively advocates nuclear disarmament and supports, in particular, the creation of a nuclear-free zone in North Europe.

V

Naturally, the position of the nuclear powers (upon realization of such partial measures as the creation of nuclear-free zones) is extraordinarily important primarily from the viewpoint of a positive solution of the problems of nuclear disarmament. Taking this circumstance into consideration and taking account of all aspects thereof connected with the implementation of the provisions of the "Avarua Treaty," the countries of the South Pacific Forum appended thereto three protocols addressed to the nuclear powers.

Protocol I pertains to the United States, Great Britain and France inasmuch as they control, in accordance with this legal status or the other, certain territories within the confines of the zone defined by the "Avarua Treaty". Thus for France this means New Caledonia and French Polynesia and also the Wallis and Futuna islands. The United States owns Eastern Samoa, while Great Britain owns Pitcairn Island. According to the protocol, the said nuclear powers may assume in respect of the enumerated territories the basic commitments assumed in accordance with the treaty (articles 3, 5 and 6) by the South Pacific Forum members.

The two other protocols are opened for signing by all the nuclear powers. Protocol II provides for the commitments: first, not to contribute to any actions which represent a violation of the provisions of the treaty and its protocols by the countries which have signed them; second, not to use nuclear explosive devices and not to threaten their use against subscribers to the treaty and the South Pacific territories controlled by the powers which sign Protocol I. Protocol III deals with the commitment not to test any nuclear explosive devices within the confines of the nuclear-free zone.

Consultations with the nuclear powers which consider these protocols acceptable to themselves are envisaged for final touches to the wording contained in the protocols. It is planned examining the results of the consultations, if such take place, at the session of the South Pacific Forum in 1986.

For realization of the provisions of the "Avarua Treaty" paramount significance in the light of the facts expounded above is attached to the reaction thereto on the part of Washington and Paris. And it cannot be called promising.

The point being that the treaty on the nuclear-free zone, as, equally, the New Zealand Government's ban on calls at its ports of ships carrying nuclear weapons, not only affects the Pentagon's military activity in the subregion but is also perceived politically as an extremely undesirable precedent from the viewpoint of the United States. Washington fears a chain reaction of the spread of anti-nuclear sentiments and, what is most important, the adoption under the influence thereof of practical steps which could impede realization of the United States' military-political strategy within the framework of the entire Asia-Pacific region.

It is here that the reason for the power pressure to which New Zealand is being subjected on the part of the United States lies. In Canberra in July 1985 in connection with the Australian-American negotiations being conducted there, which had replaced the annual meeting of the participants in the ANZUS bloc (Washington had insisted on its cancellation on account of Wellington's antinuclear measures), Secretary of State G. Shultz publicly expressed "serious reservations" in respect of the plans for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. According to press reports, the United States is putting pressure on some participants in the forum to ensure that they not sign the "Avarua Treaty".

At the same time, however, Washington cannot fail to consider, albeit partially, the interests of its most important ally in the region--Australia. Yet Canberra has already made it understood that it expects U.S. assistance in prompting France to cease nuclear tests. The Australian Government has also proposed reducing the number of calls by American warships at ports of the country's west coast.

In turn, France has unequivocally declared its intention to continue nuclear explosions on Mururoa Atoll, which (together with the well-known circumstances connected with the blowing up of the "Rainbow Warrior" in the port of the New Zealand city of Auckland) has contributed to an exacerbation of relations between Paris on the one hand and Canberra and Wellington on the other. Last year even W. Hayden warned of the possibility of "stricter actions" on the part of

Australia in addition to the halt to supplies to France of uranium ore as a sign of protest against its nuclear tests.

There is no doubt that implementation of the "Avarua Treaty" will require prolonged and significant efforts--and not only on the part of the South Pacific states.

As far as the Soviet Union's position is concerned, it believes that countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and do not have such on their territory have the right to dependable international-law guarantees of their security and to the fact that nuclear weapons will not be used against them.

In September 1985, during the UN General Assembly 40th Session, talks were held in New York between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Australian Foreign Minister W. Hayden and G. Palmer, deputy prime minister of New Zealand. The Soviet side confirmed the USSR's positive attitude toward the decision of the South Pacific countries to create a nuclear-free zone in this region and noted the positive reaction which this decision had evoked in the world.

The idea put forward by the Soviet Union of a comprehensive approach to ensuring security in Asia and the Pacific elicited extensive comment. The implementation of measures of a regional nature could make a considerable contribution to the strengthening of international security and a curbing of the arms race.

The statement of the meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee on 22-23 October in Sofia emphasized the particular significance of the consolidation of peace and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific and a strengthening of trust and security here. It noted, in particular, that the efforts of the South Pacific states to create a nuclear-free zone serve the interests of ensuring general security.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 8144/0572

JULY 1985 INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE CONGRESS: ARMS ISSUES STRESSED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 106-113

[V. Lukov report: "Constructive Dialogue (Results of the 13th Congress of the International Political Science Association)"]

[Text] A major event of international scientific life of the departing year was the 13th World Congress of the International Political Science Association* (IPSA) (it was held from 15 through 20 July in Paris). Approximately 2,000 scholars from more than 40 countries participated.

Addressing the congress' opening ceremony, which was held in the assembly hall of the Sorbonne--"Large Amphitheater"--IPSA President K. von (Bayme) (FRG)** called the delegates' attention to the huge panel on a wall of the hall depicting in allegorical form the various sciences and jokingly complained that room had not been found here for political science. The Paris congress of the IPSA provides a wealth of material for penning a portrait of this science, although it would evidently be difficult to find a more mobile and mosaic "sitter". Having taken shape as an independent science comparatively recently, political science is experiencing to the full extent the impact of all the trends characteristic of the development of contemporary scientific knowledge. New fields of study are being distinguished rapidly, which reflects on the one hand growing specialization within the framework of political science itself (study of international policy relations, global studies) and, on the other, the integration of different sciences leading to the appearance of "intersection" branches like political sociology, geography and psychology. A very strong influence on contemporary political science is being exerted by the dynamic and contradictory development of the object of its study--world politics.

* The International Political Science Association (IPSA) was created in 1949 under the aegis of UNESCO. The organization sets as its goal assistance to the development of political science by way of international conferences, the dissemination of political science information and the coordination of international research. The main press organ of the IPSA is the journal INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW. The association had 39 collective, 90 associate and more than 1,200 individual members in 1985. World congresses of the association are held once every three years. The 11th IPSA Congress was held in Moscow (1979).

** At the IPSA Executive Committee session in July 1985 (K. Musyakodzi) (Japan) was elected president of the association for 1985-1988.

The congress itself shortly became an arena of political struggle, which assumed the distinctive form of a correspondence polemic between long-standing rivals--J.-P. Chevenement, a leader of the French Socialist Party and education minister in the socialist government, and J. Chirac, mayor of Paris and prominent Gaullist Party figure. Speaking at the opening of the congress, J.-P. Chevenement made an exceptionally high evaluation of the effectiveness of the concept of the French state's participation in the country's economic, scientific-technical and cultural development. But 2 hours later J. Chirac, receiving delegates in the city hall's Gobelin Room, spoke no less categorically about the "crisis of the concepts of state control being adopted currently" and called on the international community of political scientists, primarily his compatriots, to elaborate a "balanced" theory which would guard against excessive state interference in the life of society.

An important place in the work of the Paris forum of political scientists was occupied by international policy problems, which were discussed within the framework of the topic "Global Problems: Challenge to the State". The sessions of 12 committees and 11 study groups, at which more than 150 papers (20 percent of the total number of papers delivered at the congress) were received and discussed, were devoted to it. The intensive exchange of opinions and the debate, very pointed at times, which developed at the sessions of the committees and study groups reflected in relief the main directions of the development of contemporary political science and the main centers of the ideological-theoretical confrontation pertaining to the most important problems of world politics.

The following Soviet scholars participated actively in the debate: G. Shakhnazarov, president of the Soviet Political Science Association, V. Zhurkin, M. Maksimova and others. A distinctive feature of the papers presented at the congress by the Soviet international affairs specialists was the fact that they examined together with a discursive Marxist analysis of the contemporary trends of world development the broad spectrum of specific directions of the efforts to remove the threat of war and consolidate general peace. These were a strengthening of strategic stability, an expansion of cooperation between individual countries and integration associations of East and West and the creation of a new international political order based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and broad democratism in the mutual relations of different states. Particular emphasis in the speeches of a number of Soviet scholars was put on a study of the possibilities and forms of influence of the people's masses on world politics. A session of the "Marxist Political Thought" study group, which evoked the congress participants' considerable interest, was devoted to this subject.

At the Center of the Debate--the Main Problem of the Present Day

The congress was held against the background of a pronounced strengthening of conservative trends in Western and, primarily, American political science reflecting the shift to the right in the policy of a number of leading Western countries. As a result concepts postulating a "re-ideologization of international relations and the primacy of the military-strength factor as the main driving force of world politics have moved to the forefront in the sphere

of international policy studies. The struggle of the two social systems in these concepts is automatically extended to the sphere of interstate relations, which, by virtue of this, are viewed from the angle of inevitable and all-embracing rivalry. Whence the proposition is deduced concerning the "historical inevitability" of the confrontation and antagonism of states with different social systems--a proposition which has now been adopted by reactionary forces in the United States and West Europe for "scientific justification" of a militarist, aggressive policy.

Such an approach to an analysis of international relations was subjected to cogent criticism at the congress, primarily on the part of scholars from the socialist countries. As P. Karaivanova (Bulgaria) emphasized in her paper, the concepts put forward by its supporters "reduce the entire multiformity of the processes occurring in the system of international relations to conflict. And, furthermore, the conflict assumes the determining role of 'axis' of international relations."* Naturally, the ideological confrontation even in the nuclear-space age is not replaced by some "general," "planetary" ideology. However, the community of fundamental interests of all mankind is creating the objective conditions for "a reorganization of the global international system whereby account would be taken of the different interests of states of opposite social systems and equality and the removal of domination and subordination in the solution of international problems, ultimately, the removal of international conflicts would be guaranteed in relations between them".**

It should be noted that at the congress itself the supporters of rightwing-conservative views and concepts constituted an, albeit active, extremely negligible minority. Among them was, inter alia, (R. Malli), a high official of the U.S. State Department, who attempted to prove that the cause of the deadlock at the disarmament negotiations is some "secretiveness" of Soviet society creating an "insurmountable barrier" in the way of trust in bilateral relations, and the American political scientist (M. Stol), who devoted his paper to pseudoscientific speculation on the subject of the "methods of international terrorism" allegedly employed by the USSR. However, the main tone of the debate was set by no means by these speeches, which would have been more appropriate for propaganda briefings conducted by the White House. The overwhelming majority of the international affairs scholars, including those from capitalist states, expressed serious concern in connection with the growth of international tension and advocated a serious, constructive dialogue with scholars from the USSR and other socialist countries. Thus C. Hermann, the well-known American specialist in the study of international crises, emphasized in his paper that the round of a qualitative arms race which is unfolding is undermining strategic stability and "thus increasing the likelihood of war." Indian representative T. (Bouz) pointed to the growth of the nuclear threat both for the nuclear powers themselves and also for all other states. Finnish political scientist R. Vayrynen noted in his speech the alarming exacerbation of international tension, which is having a negative effect on the position of small countries, primarily those in the zone of confrontation of the military blocs.

* R. Karaivanova, "Ideological Differences and International Conflicts. Papers Presented at the 13th World Congress of the IPSA," Sofia, 1985, pp 35-36.

** P. Karaivanova, Op. cit.

A considerable place at the congress was occupied by a discussion of questions connected with a strengthening of strategic stability. The increased attention of Western, primarily American, political scientists to this set of problems in the 1980's is highly symptomatic. Although the first works devoted to questions of strategic stability appeared in the West more than 20 years ago,* this subject remained for a long time outside of the field of vision of bourgeois political scientists. This situation is explained to a considerable extent by the belief which was predominant in U.S. academic circles that the basis of international security was America's superior nuclear power and that the way to strengthening it lay through a buildup of this power.

The departure of a considerable proportion of Western political scientists from such principles was manifested at the Paris congress. However, the ongoing reassessment of values is of a highly contradictory nature. Although to judge by the speeches at the congress, the majority of Western experts, American included, discern the causes of the erosion of strategic stability in the actions both of the United States and the USSR, even the facts which they adduced point unambiguously to the true culprit of the present dangerous trends of the development of the situation in this sphere. Thus C. Hermann observed in his speech that "the biggest influence on... stability was exerted by the installation on missiles of separable warheads which the American side started in the first half of the 1970's." One further step destabilizing the situation is, Hermann believes, the deployment of arms systems reducing the other side's decision-making time, and, furthermore, the factor here which will be "decisive... will be the creation of systems intended to hit ground- and sea-based missiles in the boost phase."** But it is precisely such systems (kinetic weapons and X-ray lasers) which the Pentagon intends incorporating in the structure of American antimissile defenses!

J. Kugler, W. Petersen and F. Zagare (United States), specialists in the mathematical modeling of strategy, essentially reached similar conclusions. Citing their calculations, they observed in the paper that the existing concepts of launching nuclear strikes at the armed forces and inhabited localities of the enemy and also the deployment of the American intermediate-range missiles in West Europe are unwarranted from the viewpoint of maintaining the stability of the strategic situation. The "strategic defense initiative" concept, which one author of the above-mentioned paper called an "absurdity," reasonably noting that "in the dangerous world in which we live the threat to stability cannot be removed on the paths of weapons refinement,"*** was sharply criticized also.

Where, then, is the way out of the current alarming situation? As the debate showed, many Western political scientists see it in a return to the "stable mutual restraint" which existed, they believe, up to the mid-1970's. The supporters of "strategic restoration" consider necessary here the elaboration of measures for strengthening stability and trust which would on the one hand prove to a potential enemy the absence of aggressive intentions in the other

* See T. Schelling, "The Strategy of Conflict," Cambridge, 1960.

** See C. Hermann, "The Ultimate Crisis in the Nuclear Era," 13th ISPA Congress, Paris, 1985, pp 4, 6.

*** J. Kugler, W. Petersen, F. Zagare, "The Longterm Stability of Deterrence," 13th IPSA Congress, Paris, 1985, pp 27-28.

side, for which a renunciation of counterforce concepts and their corresponding weapons systems is proposed, in particular, and, on the other, increase the "credibility" of "restraint" potential, that is, contribute to the deterrence of the enemy.

Could this path lead to a strengthening of strategic stability and thereby to international security? It is extremely doubtful. After all, first, this concept provides not for a halt to the arms race but merely its "stabilization," that is, confinement to certain spheres and subordination to certain "rules". Yet available experience testifies that achieving this is extraordinarily difficult, if not altogether impossible, particularly under conditions where as a result of Washington's actions mankind is confronted by the threat of the spread of the arms race to new spheres, primarily to space. If we do not succeed in averting such a development of events, all the efforts that have been made hitherto to curb the militarization process will prove to have been canceled out. Second, the "mutual restraint" strategy, as its present-day supporters acknowledge, permits and even presupposes the use of threats, nuclear blackmail and the simulation of "reckless" actions. "It could be necessary for a partner to resort to threats and to engage in actions which would not appear prudent in order for his threat to be taken seriously. However, such a strategy, we believe, is justified if the threats help achieve or preserve a balance of restraint," S. Brams (United States) and M. Kilgour (Canada) declared in the course of the debate at the congress. But then the world would have to pay for "stability" with constant international tension and an endless chain of crises. And where is the guarantee that one of them would not culminate in nuclear catastrophe as a consequence of the simulation of "recklessness" not having been taken seriously by the other side?

The intrinsic contradictoriness of the "restoration of mutual restraint" concepts is manifested graphically in the practical recommendations proposed by their authors. Thus the same Hermann believes it essential for the purpose of strengthening strategic stability to rebuild the arsenals such that there remain therein only "stabilizing" systems, to which pertain, in his opinion, mobile ICBM's with a single-charge warhead and bombers. However, the "stabilizing" effect of such actions would seem highly dubious if it is considered that each of these systems possesses a whole set of characteristics which, combined with the quantity factor, could lead (and are leading) to serious "disturbances" in the strategic situation. Is it legitimate, say, to consider "stabilizing" the Midgetman missile, considering such of its characteristics as its small size and mobility making identification and computation of the arsenal difficult? Could the Stealth bomber, the basis of whose engineering and operational concept is the idea of the impossibility of detection, which conceals a threat of surprise attack, stabilize the strategic situation?

Another proposal of Hermann's--the nuclear powers' adoption of "a solemn policy of renunciation of a nuclear first strike against national command centers"--is also fraught in practice with the danger of a serious destabilization of the situation. After all, it is nothing other than an invitation to the formulation of some "rules" of the exchange of nuclear strikes. Understandably,

such "rules," however good the intentions guiding their authors, would not strengthen stability but, on the contrary, weaken it even more if only because they postulate in advance the possibility and admissibility of nuclear war.

Yet only an all-embracing and unconditional renunciation of the first use of nuclear, as also of any other, weapons could be a truly effective measure of stabilization of the situation and, what is of fundamental importance, stimulus to its profound transformation. This thought was heard in the speeches of scholars from socialist countries--V. Zhurkin (USSR) and C. Montag (GDR)--who emphasized that the principle of renunciation of the use of force, which was recorded 40 years ago in the UN Charter, can and must be an effective barrier in the way of international crises and wars. The forms and methods of confirmation of this principle must correspond to the current international situation and the dangers with which it is fraught. In particular, there is an urgent need to record in treaty form the renunciation by the NATO and Warsaw Pact states of the first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons. The conclusion of such a treaty would contribute not only to a strengthening of security in Europe but also to the creation of a new, truly secure world order.*

Considerable changes were ascertained at the Paris congress in the approach of a significant proportion of Western political scientists to the problems of international crises. The "crisis management" concept, which had been advanced in the 1960's as the last word in the West's foreign policy thought,** had been discredited by the failures of U.S. "crisis diplomacy" which followed at the end of the decade. In the 1980's interest in problems of crisis management have arisen anew, but on a different basis. An increasingly large number of Western political scientists is concluding that under the conditions of the military-strategic parity of the two systems the former tendencies of "crisis diplomacy" toward the imposition of one's will are not simply ineffective but also fraught with mortal danger for those who practice these methods. There is a growing understanding that the basis of the approach to a settlement of crises in the modern world must be the principle of consideration of the legitimate interests of the parties involved therein. Addressing the congress, the Australian specialist J. Richardson expressed this thought thus: "Success (in crisis management--V.L.)... should be understood not only as the avoidance of war but also as an approach which lowers tension or, at least, does not increase the danger of war in the future. And this means that the way out of the crisis must be so acceptable to the most important parties involved therein that they consider it legitimate."***

This principle, which is now shared by a growing number of Western political scientists, is stimulating a quest for rules of the mutual relations of states belonging to opposite social systems, primarily the United States and the USSR,

* C. Montag, "Renunciation of the Use of Force and the New World Order," 13th IPSA Congress Abstracts Nos 2-3, Paris, 1985, p 39.

** A pronouncement of former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara made in 1962 is significant in this connection: "Henceforward there is no concept of strategy. There is only the management of crises."

*** J. Richardson, "Crisis Management. A Critical Appraisal," 13th IPSA Congress, Paris, 1985, p 15.

in regional conflicts and crises ("rules of competition") which would correspond to the interests of both sides.* The participants' considerable attention in this connection was caught by the paper of the prominent American international affairs specialist A. George, around which lively debate developed.**

Proceeding from the fact that rivalry between the United States and the USSR "could be limited... by the formulation of norms of competition," the American scholar proposed a typology of such "norms" based on the separation of six regional situations: "symmetry of the vital interests of the United States and the USSR; symmetry of secondary interests of both sides; asymmetry of interests in favor of the USSR; asymmetry of interests in favor of the United States; debatable balance of interests; indeterminate balance of interests."***

Under conditions where U.S. ruling circles are demonstrating virtually daily a disregard for the legitimate interests of other states and attempting to impose on the USSR and its allies one-sided solutions of key problems of international politics, the very idea of the formulation of mutually acceptable norms of American-Soviet relations advanced by sober-minded American scholars and politicians merits serious attention. However, in its present form the concept of the "controlled competition" of the two great powers gives rise to a whole number of questions and objections.

Although George and other supporters of this concept set as their task the elaboration of rules of American-Soviet relations in respect of third countries, their outlines leave no room for the interests of these countries themselves. It is assumed that the latter would have to submit to the will of the "superpower" whose interests in a given situation would be declared "predominant". As it is not difficult to discern, this premise is close to the old idea of the division of the world into "spheres of interest"--an idea which long since showed its untenability in a world in which turbulent sociopolitical changes are occurring. Attention is also attracted to the fact that the "norms" and "rules" proposed by the American political scientists are intended primarily (and at times exclusively) for regulating the rivalry of the United States and the USSR. However, such an approach limits in advance the

* See H. Bull, "The Anarchic Society," London, 1977; R. Cohen, "International Politics. The Rules of the Game," London, 1981; J. Gowa, N. Wessell, "Ground Rules: Soviet and American Involvement in Regional Conflicts," Philadelphia, 1982; P. Kael, "Unspoken Rules and Superpower Dominance," London, 1983; N. Matheson, "The 'Rules of the Game' of Superpower Military Intervention in the Third World," New York, 1982; "Managing U.S.-Soviet Rivalry: Problems of Crisis Prevention," ed. by A. George, Boulder, 1983.

** A. George, "U.S.-Soviet Global Rivalry: Norms of Competition," 13th IPSA Congress, Paris, 1985.

*** See A. George, Op. cit., pp 6-7.

possibilities of the cooperation of the two states and, more broadly, the two social systems. Yet, as the experience of the detente of the 1970's showed, the creation of more developed norms of relations affording prospects of the fruitful interaction and cooperation of states with opposite social systems in the political, economic and other spheres is perfectly possible.

Regional Aspects of International Security

The Paris congress examined a broad spectrum of regional international policy problems. Its participants paid particular attention to the situation in Europe, Central America and Southeast Asia.*

The tense ideological-political struggle which is being conducted around the problems of European security was manifested in full in the diversity of viewpoints expressed at the congress and the sharpness of the debate. The tone of the debate was set by the speeches of a number of Western political scientists, which attempted to justify various "alternative" concepts of European security.

Highly indicative in this respect was the speech of West German political scientist H. Wulf. The point of departure of his arguments was the proposition concerning the existence of "manifest disagreements and divergent interests" between the United States and its West European partners. The West German scholar believes that the growing conflict in transatlantic relations is reflected in the unceasing debate within NATO on the role of strategic, including space-based, weapons, the prospects of detente and arms limitation and East-West trade. However, H. Wulf believes, this debate represents merely the outward manifestation of more profound differences in the perception of the "Soviet military threat"--"a phenomenon which cannot be either confirmed or refuted on the theoretical level, but whose existence is highly unrealistic."** Having distinguished the three most likely, from his viewpoint, versions of security policy for West Europe ("continuation of the previous policy, whereby the United States occupies the dominant and West Europe a subordinate position; a more independent military policy; West Europe's reliance on its own forces, where the emphasis is put, furthermore, on a policy of security and the role of the military is diminished"), the West German political scientist unequivocally advocated the final version, which provides for the formulation of a "European security policy". An inalienable component of such a policy should be, as H. Wulf emphasized, a system of accords with the USSR making it possible to lessen the nuclear threat on the continent.

A distinctive attempt to examine problems of European security from the standpoints of the small countries of the continent and to put forward on this basis an alternative to the present tense state of relations in Europe was made by the well-known scholar from Finland R. Vayrynen. We have to agree with the Finnish specialist that the role of the neutral and nonaligned states (the so-called N + N group) in European politics, in the all-European process

* Unfortunately, the problems connected with the situation in the Near East and Southern Africa enjoyed no in any way thorough examination in the speeches of Western political scientists.

** H. Wulf, "A Europeanist Approach to Security and Disarmament," 13th IPSA Congress Abstracts, Paris, 1985, p 62.

primarily, has grown considerably in the past decade. However, his proposition concerning the existence in the small members of the confrontational military alliances and neutral states of a specific common interest--"an aspiration to the removal of nuclear weapons from Europe"*--would seem highly contentious. It is hardly possible to agree with such a counterpoise of the interests of the "small" and "big" European states regardless of the differences in the approaches of the latter to the problems of nuclear disarmament on the continent. It is well known that the freeing of the European continent from nuclear weapons, as also their liquidation altogether, is the fundamental goal of the USSR. Our country has advanced a whole number of initiatives designed to achieve this goal--from the creation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of Europe through the complete removal of nuclear weapons (both tactical and medium-range) from the territory of the continent. And, conversely, the leading NATO members are stubbornly refusing to take practical steps in the direction of a reduction in the nuclear danger in Europe, alluding to the fact that this would undermine the "credibility" of the alliance's military strategy.

Speeches were also heard at the Paris congress which were sustained in a spirit of Atlantism and defense of NATO policy. Typical in this respect was the paper of the French political scientist P. Lellouche, which essentially represented a precis of his recently published book with the loud title of "The Future of War".** Asserting that there had in recent years been an "undermining of West Europe's security," P. Lellouche pointed as reasons for the current situation to "the unprecedented growth of Soviet military power" and also the "mistakes" and "concessions" on the part of the West in the 1970's. Merely the list thereof is highly indicative: recognition at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of the territorial-political realities on the continent which had taken shape since WWII and which had been determined by the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; the conversion of the process begun in Helsinki into a forum for the discussion of problems of security and disarmament in Europe; the collapse of the hopes that the expansion of the West's economic cooperation with the socialist countries would lead to a change in their domestic and foreign policy; and, finally, a certain "recognition by Europeans of the Soviet concept of the divisibility of detente".

The scientific groundlessness of such views was shown convincingly in the speeches of scholars from the socialist countries. Behind such an "analysis of the West's mistakes," which, incidentally, has been highly popular in the 1980's among West European and American political scientists of a conservative persuasion, is an endeavor to call in question and portray in a negative light generally the entire experience of European development in the 1970's. After all, among the "mistakes" here are put most important accords of the detente period, which contributed to an improvement in the atmosphere on the continent. Yet, as M. Schmidt (GDR) emphasized in his paper, a truly objective, balanced analysis of detente and a sober evaluation of the prospects of collective security in Europe insistently demand a careful consideration and collation

* R. Vayrynen, "Neutrality and Dealignment in Europe," 13th IPSA Congress Abstracts Nos 2-3, Paris, 1985, p 58.

** P. Lellouche, "L'avenir de la guerre," Paris, 1985.

primarily of the positive potential which was accumulated in the 1970's. The very approach to the "security" category requires profound rethinking. Under conditions where attempts to ensure security by way of a buildup of military power are fraught with the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe a new understanding of security as primarily a political category is essential. "Security can no longer be achieved today in defiance of the other side but only in conjunction with it, as common security based on equality," M. Schmidt emphasized in his speech.*

A considerable number of papers at the Paris IPSA congress was devoted to problems of Southeast Asia, and the greatest assertiveness here was displayed by American political scientists, what is more. The higher-than-usual interest of representatives of the U.S. political-academic complex in the Southeast Asian countries is not fortuitous. Located in a strategically important region and rich in natural resources, these countries are playing an increasingly pronounced part in the system of international relations in Asia and the Pacific. For U.S. leading circles the significance of Southeast Asia is increasing even further in connection with the fact that it is seen as a kind of connecting link in the context of the plans being hatched by imperialism for the creation of a "Pacific community" and the system of military-political agreements in the Indian Ocean which already exists.

The speeches of the American specialists at the congress represented not so much an analysis of the contradictory trends characterizing relations between countries of this region as an attempt to justify U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. Of course, fabrications concerning the "Soviet military threat" to the Southeast Asian countries, "Vietnam's expansion" in the region and so forth had to be expressed here. But whereas such rhetoric is customary and does not merit attention, it is necessary to dwell on another "argument" of the American political scientists. It is a question of attempts to depict as a cause of the tension in Southeast Asia (and not only here)... the UN Law of the Sea Convention which was signed in 1982! Thus, R. Rau, scientific associate of the U.S. Naval Academy, asserts, this document "has been unable to provide a satisfactory framework for settlement of the conflict of national interests," and allegedly "not one government in the world is prepared to deal with the problem of 200-mile economic zones." Finally, the UN convention allegedly "complicates ships' passage through international straits," in the waters of Southeast Asia included.** It is not difficult to see that these "scientific" conclusions of the American political scientist practically coincide textually with the propositions of Washington officials, who are now making feverish efforts to frustrate the realization of a most important document of international law and impose their will on the world community in questions of the use of the resources of the oceans.

R. Rau, R. Horne and a number of other American specialists endeavored to portray U.S. policy in Southeast Asia as the main "guarantee of the security" of the countries of this region. Provocatively expatiating on some "shift to the

* M. Schmidt, "Conditions and Chances for Collective Security in Europe," 13th IPSA Congress Abstracts Nos 2-3, 1985, p 50.

** R. Rau, "Current and Future Security Issues in the Seas of South China and Indochina," 13th IPSA Congress, Paris, 1985, pp 2, 4, 5.

South China Sea of the present confrontational relations between the PRC and the USSR," bourgeois political scientists asserted that the sole means of "strengthening stability" in Southeast Asia is an increase in the American military presence in this region, the United States' closer cooperation with Japan and South Korea and the imparting to ASEAN of the functions of a military bloc.*

The flaw in such a "security concept" for Southeast Asia was shown convincingly in the speeches of scholars from the socialist countries. It is none other than Washington which is in reality the enemy of a genuine normalization of interstate relations in Southeast Asia. The strengthening of the U.S. military presence, the importunate exaggeration of the so-called "Cambodian question" and the attempts to create in the region exclusive military groupings are merely engendering in Southeast Asia a new set of acute problems--an arms race and discord and conflicts with other Asian states. The real path toward lasting peace and security in this region lies not via the "adaptation" of the interests of the peoples of Southeast Asia to the goals of the United States or any other states (certain bourgeois political scientists called for this essentially at the congress) but via a consideration of the legitimate interests of these peoples, including the Cambodian people.

The subject of the conflict in Central America and U.S. aggression against Caribbean countries was a new one for IPSA congresses. True, the bourgeois political scientists, who considered themselves "serious," preferred not to broach this subject, and as justification, what is more, they referred to the fact that the problems of Central America "are of a conjunctural nature," "too ideologized for an objective analysis" and "insufficiently supported by information". Such arguments were of a manifestly contrived nature and concealed rather the conformism of the present "respectable" bourgeois political science of the West and its fear of "displeasing" the conservative circles in power in a number of leading capitalist countries. Nonetheless, the crisis situation which has taken shape in Central America through the fault of U.S. imperialism and local reaction did become a subject of discussion at the Paris congress. On the Western side papers on this problem were delivered by American political scientists of a liberal persuasion.

One of them, M. Waters, analyzed in detail in his speech, which was devoted to international political repercussions of the United States' invasion of Grenada, the arguments which Washington had put forward in justification of its aggressive actions. He pointed out that, besides the direct negative impact on the security of countries of the Caribbean region, the United States' actions also have highly dangerous indirect consequences for international peace. "International law and order," M. Waters emphasized, "will be jeopardized if actions and arguments like those which have been employed in this case are juggled to satisfy official goals and are advanced in place of the traditional views of international law based on the peaceful solution of conflicts."**

* R. Rau, "Current and Future Security Issues in the Seas of South China and Indochina," 13th IPSA Congress, Paris, 1985, p 16.

** M. Waters, "The Invasion of Grenada 1983 and the Collapse of the Legal Norms," 13th IPSA Abstracts Nos 2-3, 1985, p 60.

The paper of A. Fields sounded as an unambiguous warning to U.S. ruling circles. On the basis of actual facts the American specialist demonstrated the fallacy of bourgeois propaganda's proposition that the "Vietnam syndrome" has disappeared and that the majority of Americans support an escalation of Washington's interference in the events in Central America. On the contrary, U.S. aggression against the peoples of Nicaragua and El Salvador has already given birth to an antiwar movement, which in terms of its sociopolitical base and thrust is similar to the movement against the war in Indochina. Continued escalation of American interference will inevitably lead to its further growth.

The world forum of political scientists held in Paris was, despite the considerable differences in the views and positions of the participants which were revealed in the course of its work, the venue of a constructive, serious discussion of key problems of world politics. In the 5 days of the congress' work the "points of growth" of contemporary political science, the main centers of the ideological-theoretical struggle and the directions of the dialogue of specialists from different countries were revealed in relief. The new ideas and concepts advanced at the congress (although far from all of them can be accepted)--the features of the "portrait" of the young political science--merit Soviet scholars' attentive analysis.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

BOOK ON SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF NUCLEAR WAR REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 136-137

[V. Yemelyanov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, review: "Topical Work"]

[Text] The book in question* was published under the aegis of the Scientific Council for Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament and prepared with the assistance of the Soviet Peace Foundation. It represents the collective work of specialists from four fundamental branches of science: economics, mathematics, chemistry and physics. The authors are connected with the work being performed in a number of our country's leading research institutes and have constructed their analysis on a strictly scientific basis. As far as the actual problem being analyzed itself is concerned, it concerns each and everyone.

Almost 20 years ago in the UN General Assembly resolved to entrust to UN Secretary General U Thant the preparation with the help of expert consultants of a special report on the consequences of the acquisition, development and use of nuclear weapons. Scientists representing 12 UN members** made up the UN scientific-consultative committee set up for this purpose. Many years have elapsed since then, but the process of a further refinement of nuclear weapons continues at increasing speed. These weapons themselves and the means of delivering them to the planned targets are being perfected and the stockpiles thereof are growing. For this reason the publication of the book being reviewed here would appear not only opportune but also acutely necessary.

As the authors are perfectly correct in observing right in the foreword, over the decades "there has been so much said about the danger of nuclear war and its disastrous consequences for the fate of mankind that people have in many cases ceased to react to this danger, are adapting to it and are ceasing to notice it, as it were" (p 3).

* "Gubitelnyye posledstviya yadernoy voyny (sotsialno-ekonomicheskiye aspekty) [Disastrous Consequences of a Nuclear War (Socioeconomic Aspects)], Moscow, Glavnaya redaktsiya izdaniy dlya zarubezhnykh stran izdatelstva "Nauka",

** The author of this review was a member of this committee from the USSR (ed. note).

One frequently hears: "Is the degree of danger of a nuclear war as great as they say?" Some dishonest politicians are contributing to a lulling of people's vigilance, spreading "unfounded assertions concerning the possibility of a limited nuclear war with small losses.... They forget here about the complexity of the modern interconnections of conflict situations and the devastating power of nuclear weapons, which dictate the sides' different tactics and strategy of behavior in a nuclear war compared with a conventional war and which will lead directly to the escalation of a world nuclear catastrophe in the event of a limited nuclear conflict being unleashed" (pp 3-4).

Underestimation of the disastrous consequences of a nuclear war is extremely dangerous since, as the book is entirely correct to emphasize, the main target in such a war is objectively people and the mode of organization of their life, that is, civilization as such, and not states' military systems. For this reason orientation toward nuclear war is orientation toward self-genocide (p 4).

Examining in the first chapter the scale and nature of possible devastation and comparing a nuclear explosion with major natural catastrophes, the authors are perfectly correct in characterizing it "as a targeted catastrophic phenomenon directed by people" (p 8). This, they believe, is the fundamental difference of a thermonuclear catastrophe from any elemental cataclysm (ibid.) They write that "the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war for contemporary human society are predetermined by the particular vulnerability of the highly organized social forms of man's existence at the current stage, primarily by the vulnerability of the delicate and fragile economic mechanisms which constitute the basis of the normal functioning of civilization in the face of the colossal devastation which will accompany nuclear explosions in densely populated areas of our planet" (p 21).

Exposing the American figures who irresponsibly claim that America would be reborn from the nuclear ashes in 2-4 years, the Soviet scientists emphasize: "the people who survive a nuclear catastrophe will experience totally incomparable and unpredictable suffering and deprivation". A most important factor will be the fact they will have to live in a devastated and totally transformed environment (p 26).

This viewpoint is shared by many sober-minded people in the United States itself. Highly authoritative voices warning against illusions are being heard increasingly loudly there currently. A study conducted in 1979 by the U.S. Congress' Technology Assessment Office and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency observed that as "the result of an exchange of nuclear strikes up to two-thirds of the population in America could perish, while the position of the survivors would be unprecedented" (p 50).

What this position could be like is discussed in the final chapter of the work. The authors believe that a nuclear catastrophe would cast mankind back into an age of barbarity, and the regression would occur, moreover, given man's simultaneous physical degeneration. "As is known, society's productive forces represent a system of subjective (man) and technical, in the broad meaning of the word, elements. The main productive force of any society is people,

the participants in social production". A nuclear war would inevitably lead to physiological, moral, mental and other changes in this main productive force. Following a nuclear war the functioning of the remnants of mankind, the book says, "would be characterized by an unprecedented decline in the productive forces to the level of primitive tools and subjects of labor given a simultaneous degradation of mankind" (pp 57, 60).

The authors observe that a more detailed forecast of the possibilities of society's existence and functioning following a nuclear war is complicated by insufficient study of the long-term composite influence of total nuclear war on all aspects of the life of our planet. "Theoretically," they write, "granted the entire diversity and multiplicity of long-term results of a nuclear war, there can be only two outcomes for mankind--either it will perish for this reason or the other or it will slowly 'be reborn from the ashes'. Taking as a basis the analysis which has been made of the possibility of the restoration of the current forms of the economy and society, it may be said that evolution to the current level, if possible at all, would represent a millennium of slow progress in man's mastery of methods of increasing the production of products ensuring his vital activity" (p 62). And the work contains the entirely legitimate question: "Will homo post-nucleatus have sufficient courage, wisdom and persistence to survive the depths of tragedy and revert to a new spiral of historical development?" (ibid.).

Soviet scientists believe that, given the assessment of the economic and social consequences of a general nuclear war, uncertainty applies only to the details, as a whole, however, "the picture of the ruin of civilization in its contemporary form appears with sufficient amplitude and clarity" (p 65).

The book emphasizes that such a forecast is "not an exaggeration and not an attempt to deliberately lay it on thick but a realistic assessment of the danger, underestimation of which could result in a tragedy of planetary proportions. The death of hundreds of millions of people, the annihilation of all cities of any size, the destruction of energy centers and the entire energy-supply system, the liquidation of industrial potential and the annihilation of administrative, scientific and cultural centers--all this would mean a catastrophic blow to modern civilization which would throw back the part of mankind which survived many hundreds and thousands of years to primitive forms of existence and the corresponding forms of social consciousness. Such is the terrible price which would have to be paid for a slackening and the fruitlessness of efforts to avert a nuclear catastrophe" (p 66).

The work in question is a valuable contribution to literature devoted to an examination of the most acute problems of our time which have arisen in connection with the appearance of weapons of mass annihilation. It is annoying that in such a topical book there are misprints testifying to a low level of publication. The reader must guess when it was actually published: there is one date on the cover (1985), on the title page another (1984). The same thing with respect to the executive editor: whereas the reverse of the title page lists Doctor of Economic Sciences M.V. Barabanov, we learn from the publication data that this is "Doctor of Economic Sciences M.V. Baranov". Do not believe your eyes, as they say.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

BOOK ON NUCLEAR WAR PREVENTION MEASURES REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 138-139

[V. Abarenkov review: "Ways To Strengthen Peace"]

[Text] The main danger for peace today is the fact that the most aggressive circles of the U.S. ruling class and the present administration, which is executing their will, are continuing at an intensified pace to work toward acquiring strategic superiority over the USSR and its allies. Washington has declared repeatedly here that nuclear war is in principle possible and permissible and that it is necessary only to be well prepared in order to win it. Whence a variety of scenarios sometimes of "limited," sometimes of "protracted" nuclear war.

The United States openly aspires to tilt the military-strategic balance, which in the 1970's was an essential factor of the relaxation of tension. It is unceremoniously casting aside the fundamental principle formulated by the international community of the search for security by means of a reduction in and not a buildup of arms, "proving" that that "arms control" should merely assist the realization of programs for a buildup and improvement of U.S. military power. It is this that explains the fact that Washington officials are putting disarmament--a most important task, which now confronts all mankind--among the secondary issues of international life. More, the United States is moving toward transferring the arms race to space, creating a qualitatively new situation, where events could get out of control.

It is not surprising, therefore, that people on all continents are experiencing growing concern for the fate of peace. They are asking: does mankind have another way besides the stockpiling of instruments of death which would really lead to a strengthening of international peace and security? A discursive answer to this question is provided in the monograph in question.

B. Krasulin rightly observes that the nuclear threat will exist as long as nuclear weapons exist. Therefore the most effective and radical method of delivering mankind from the danger of nuclear extermination would be an international arrangement for halting the production of nuclear weapons and

* B.P. Krasulin, "Politicheskiye garantii ustraneniya yadernoy ugrozy" [Political Guarantees of Removal of the Nuclear Threat], Moscow, Izdatelstvo "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1984, p 176.

embarking on a reduction in the stockpiles thereof as far as their complete liquidation. For this purpose the USSR and its allies submitted back in 1979 a corresponding proposal for the start of practical negotiations within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. In 1985 the USSR proposed to the United States a 50-percent reduction on a reciprocal basis of their nuclear arms which could reach one another's territory.

Now, when the main problem--how to avert from mankind the threat of nuclear war--is at the forefront, it is urgently necessary to adopt a number of political and international-law measures which would help arrest mankind's slide toward catastrophe.

The author outlines absolutely correctly the list of questions adoption in respect of which of political and international-law measures could help achieve this goal: a ban on the use of nuclear weapons and the nonuse of force in international relations; a nuclear freeze; prevention of the further proliferation of nuclear weapons; the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world (pp 7-8).

The work shows convincingly why it is precisely these problems which are at the forefront today. Specific steps in this sphere demand under present conditions a display primarily of political will and are by no means bedeviled by technical questions of inspection. The solution of the said problems is aimed at easing the threat of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict given preservation of nuclear weapons themselves until it is possible to appreciably limit, reduce and embark on the gradual liquidation of nuclear arsenals.

The author convincingly discloses Soviet diplomacy's constant search for practical measures and steps which would really lead to the preservation of peace and the removal or, at least, an easing of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war in a difficult period of man's history. He shows on the basis of specific examples how the USSR and its allies are setting an example of practical efficiency and political boldness in their efforts to achieve this goal. In 1982 the Soviet Union unilaterally undertook not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Our country supported the idea of a mutual freezing of nuclear arsenals as a first step toward a reduction therein and ultimately their complete liquidation.

This also applies to the problem of banning nuclear tests stimulating a qualitative nuclear arms race. The USSR proposes that all states possessing nuclear weapons announce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, for peaceful purposes included, as of an agreed date. Setting an example of good will, the Soviet Union unilaterally announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 through 1 January 1986, calling on Washington to follow its example. In addition, were the United States, for its part, to refrain from such explosions, the moratorium would continue in effect.

The threat of the continued spread of nuclear weapons around the world, which the Soviet Union regards primarily in the context of efforts to avert the threat of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict, also remains serious. This applies primarily to areas of higher-than-usual military danger. The greater

the confidence that nuclear weapons will not show up in states which do not have such at the present time, the more the incentives for a reduction in the nuclear arsenals which exist currently.

The USSR treats with understanding the aspiration of many states to avert from themselves the nuclear threat by way of renunciation of the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons and prevention of their deployment on their territory. Whence our country's support for initiatives in the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. "The above-mentioned measures," the author writes, "...will not lead directly to the liquidation of any arms or a reduction in the strength of armed forces but their realization would undoubtedly be an appreciable contribution to the general cause of limiting the arms race and of disarmament" (p 8).

The book in question has been written by a specialist who has for many years been directly involved in problems of the Soviet Union's foreign policy and diplomacy and will undoubtedly attract the attention of all who are seriously interested in international relations at the current stage. At the same time B. Krasulin's work could only have benefited had the author revealed and linked its basic propositions with the threat looming over mankind of the transfer of the arms race to space.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

FRENCH BOOK ON NATO WEAPONS MODERNIZATION CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 139-141

[A. Chervyakov review: "Serious Threat"]

[Text] The book in question, "New Technology and the Defense of Europe,"* has been published by the French International Relations Institute (IFRI). It is devoted to the political aspects of the appearance of new types of conventional arms and the evolution which, the authors believe, has to occur in military-political concepts in this connection. The work has been written by well-known specialists, among whom are F. de Rose, former representative of France in NATO, and (I. Buaye), a leading IFRI expert on military-political problems.

As is known, the modernization of various types of arms is under way constantly. Nonetheless, the new technology in the production of conventional (nonnuclear) arms has attracted the particularly close attention of West Europe's military and political figures. The point being that an opportunity has been afforded at the present time for a qualitative leap forward in the sphere of new types of conventional weapons. Armies' equipment with them, the authors of the book believe, is noticeably influencing the strategic concepts and military doctrines of the West European NATO states.

In recent years the leading countries of the North Atlantic bloc have endeavored in enhancing the combat possibilities of conventional arms to impart to them characteristics which are close to nuclear weapons in yield. According to the data of IFRI specialists, 1 ton of new ammunition, when used against motorized formations, has approximately the same "effect" as a nuclear charge of 2 to 3 kilotons (p 62) (it is significant that all the estimates of "efficiency" adduced in the monograph are constructed on the basis of the possible use of these weapons against Soviet forces, an armored division, for example).

Active work is under way in the NATO countries currently on new types of such weapons. The most intricate radar systems, high-speed computers, including those for controlling fire and all phases of battle, and missiles

* "Nouvelles technologies et defense de l'Europe," Paris, IFRI, 1985, p 118.

with very high hit accuracy are being created (pp 92-93, 103). The central place, however, among these programs (some of them are to be realized in the immediate future) is occupied by the development of a variety of missile-pods filled with ammunition with homing components. Upon explosion they will be capable of hitting manpower and equipment effectively and over a large area. Such missile-pods containing ammunition without homing components are currently in terms of their destructive power 12-13 times inferior to nuclear warheads of approximately the same weight, according to the calculations of IFRI experts. However, it is planned having created by the end of the 1980's even systems not more than 2-3 times inferior to tactical nuclear systems. It is essentially a question of a new type of weapon of mass destruction.

Why has it been necessary at the present time to create new costly automatically controlled high-precision weapons systems? It is primarily a question of the achievement of decisive military superiority, whether it be a question of strategic nuclear missiles, space or the conventional arms sphere. It should be noted that the idea of the need for a rapid buildup of conventional arms is not new. The leaders of the North Atlantic bloc have been peddling it constantly since 1952.

The book lists the demands being made of the modernized forces of the West European NATO members and the tasks which they will have to tackle in the event of a conflict. These include destruction of enemy aviation at the bases and in areas of concentration, an attack by second and third troop echelons and much else (p 9). Similar plans are also contained in the appended report of the Organizing Committee for Study of Problems of European Security (the committee is made up of Lord Carver, General Goodpaster, K. Kaiser and other figures who are well known in the West). However, as distinct from the sections written by the French specialists, this document abounds in crude demagogic attacks on the socialist world.

The authors of the report endeavor to prove the "need" for a qualitative improvement in the conventional weapons with which the armies of the NATO countries are equipped. This can be achieved, they believe, given close coordination and cooperation--primarily of the West European partners in the aggressive bloc--both in the development and in the production of new types of arms. The Organizing Committee calculated the approximate cost of the programs for their manufacture over the next 10 years at roughly \$20 billion. In order to "shake loose" such huge resources an increase in military spending as a whole by a further minimum of 1 percent is recommended (p 55).

In giving preference in their military policy to conventional types of arms and not tactical nuclear arms militarist circles in the West are hoping to beat down the wave of the antiwar movement in their countries aimed primarily against nuclear missiles. Proceeding from these considerations, the authors of the book hope achieving additional appropriations for the "development" of conventional types of arms will be easier than for some modification of nuclear weapons.

While not yet created, the new types of conventional arms are gradually occupying an important place in Western military doctrines. (I. Buaye), for example, believes that the correlation of forces in the world which exists today calls in question the notorious NATO "flexible response" concept.

At the present time, he writes, military figures and politicians of West Europe do not doubt the American nuclear guarantees in the event of a global thermonuclear conflict. At the same time, however, the evolved parity between the USSR and the United States is seriously limiting the likelihood of the use of strategic nuclear weapons in the event of a conflict within the confines of the European continent. According to the authors, NATO's modern tactical nuclear weapons cannot serve as a guarantee of security. They see the way out of the situation in the buildup of new types of conventional arms (pp 89, 90).

In putting the emphasis on a refinement of the "classical" types of arms the IFRI specialists persistently propagandize the following proposition. Inasmuch, they say, as the United States' European NATO partners are at the present time directly dependent on the American "nuclear umbrella," the "shield" of new types of conventional arms which they themselves have created will contribute to the acquisition of "greater independence" in the defense sphere (p 15).

It cannot be said that the book completely ignores the negative aspects of the said direction of the development of military equipment. It contains mention of the expense of the programs and the difficulty of controlling the new types of weapons. Thus (I. Buaye) investigates in detail the military and political consequences of the use of these weapons in the "flash points" of the world, reasonably pointing to the risk of the outbreak in various regions of considerably bloodier conflicts (p 114).

The modern practice of the arms trade pursued in the NATO countries shows that in the struggle for sales markets they frequently offer (and sell) not only the latest modifications of aircraft, missiles and tanks but also conclude deals for arms which are still in the testing and development process. In such a situation it is not difficult to predict that the new types of conventional arms, which are essentially weapons of mass destruction, will proliferate all over the world unhindered.

Ignoring such obvious disastrous consequences, the IFRI experts nonetheless advertise the new types of conventional arms as a panacea for all West Europe's military-political problems.

In the preface to the work IFRI Director T. de Montbriale emphasized that a most important task currently is raising the "threshold" of the use of nuclear weapons: the creation of new types of conventional arms based on supermodern technology, he says, will permit a solution of this problem. Formally this thought could appear logical inasmuch as the new types of conventional arms are capable of partially replacing tactical nuclear arms. However, if it is considered that the first will not be inferior to the second in terms of the power of destruction, the decision to use then will be made at a considerably lower level and that the use itself could provoke a nuclear conflict, this proposition would seem more than unconvincing.

It is indisputable, however, that the creation on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology of a whole number of lethal systems means yet another--and highly costly--direction of the arms race and could lead in the future to the most unexpected and grim consequences in the

military and political spheres not only in Europe but in other regions of the world also. And although at the present time the plans for the deployment of new conventional arms systems have found themselves somewhat in the background compared with the insane "star wars" plans, they represent a real and serious threat to peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

BOOK ON SOVIET-JAPANESE TRADE, TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 141-142

[Yu. Kuznetsov review: "For Mutual Profit and Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] The work in question* is a comprehensive study encompassing the broad spectrum of questions of the economic relations of the USSR and Japan. It examines not only direct trade relations between the two countries but practically the entire range of bilateral economic relations.

The authors justifiably begin the analysis of Soviet-Japanese trade-economic relations with a characterization of their political aspects. They show convincingly how consistently and persistently the Soviet Union is striving for the development of mutually profitable trade and other economic relations with Japan based on the principles of good-neighborliness and mutual trust.

A completely different position has been occupied by the political elite of the Land of the Rising Sun, which is curbing in every possible way the aspiration of business circles to the development of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. As the book observes, it is precisely owing to the negative attitude of the Japanese side that an agreement on principles and a long-term program of economic cooperation for 10-15 years, which have been proposed by the USSR repeatedly, have not been concluded. Having proclaimed the proposition concerning the "inseparability of economics from politics" and on the pretext of "solidarity with the West," the Japanese Government unilaterally and without any grounds for this imposed "sanctions" in respect of the Soviet Union. They provide for a ban on exports to the USSR of technologically intricate equipment, a refusal to examine new long-term economic cooperation plans, a suspension of the agreement on scientific-technical relations and so forth. Subsequently, availing itself of the incident, organized by Western special services, involving the South Korean aircraft, which violated the USSR's state border, the Japanese side even went as far as a temporary suspension of the air service between Moscow and Tokyo.

* SSSR-Japoniya: problemy torgovo-ekonomicheskikh otnosheniy" [USSR-Japan: Problems of Trade-Economic Relations], Moscow, Izdatelstvo "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1984, p 240

Practice, however, confirmed the ineffectiveness of the economic "sanctions," the main damage from which, running into billions of yen, was sustained by Japan itself. It was ultimately forced to move to ease the artificial restrictions, although, of course, the latter had done certain damage to the two countries' relations.

The description of the present state of economic relations between the USSR and Japan is anticipated in the book by an interesting and instructive digression into their history, starting from the first years of Soviet power. The large amount of factual material which is adduced testifies as clearly as could be that for many years at different historical stages Japan's business circles interested in the development of economic relations with the USSR frequently contributed to the advancement of Soviet-Japanese relations. And now also they are disapproving, as a whole, of the government's policy of winding down economic relations with the USSR. This frame of mind of Japan's business circles was confirmed, in particular, at the ninth meeting of the Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation committees in December 1984. The joint communique emphasized the existence of favorable conditions for a further development of relations between the two countries.

The authors note that although there is a special agreement between the USSR and Japan providing for the mutual granting of most-favored-nation status, in practice the various forms of regulation employed administratively by the Japanese side are frequently contrary to the spirit of this agreement. This is manifested in the increasing attempts to "link" Soviet-Japanese trade relations with specific political problems and in the reproduction (fully or partially) of the restrictions imposed by other capitalist powers (pp 37-38).

For quarter of a century following the restoration in 1956 of diplomatic relations Soviet-Japanese trade developed unswervingly. However, a reduction in imports from the USSR has been discerned in the 1980's, while the volume of commodity turnover has declined considerably since 1983. Of course, the long stagnation in the Japanese economy and a variety of "sanctions" contributed to this also. But there were also other factors, which continue to operate even today.

In the structure of Soviet exports to Japan a significant proportion has traditionally belonged to timber, textile raw material, oil and petroleum products, solid fuel and so forth. In recent years lumber and cotton fiber have accounted for over half the value of the USSR's exports to Japan (p 55). On the other hand, the sale of machinery-technical products constitutes less than 1 percent of this sum (p 56). It would seem that the prospects for an increase in Soviet exports are connected primarily with fundamental changes in their structure, although this will not be easy, the less so in that even in Japan's raw material imports themselves the USSR's share is declining.

Among the most important problems which exist currently in Soviet-Japanese trade, the following stand out: first, the slowing as of the latter half of the 1970's of the general rate of its development, which led to a lessening of the Land of the Rising Sun's share of the USSR's foreign trade from 3.8

percent in 1975 to 3.1 percent in 1982 (p 63); second, the fluctuations in the dynamics of trade, of Soviet exports particularly; third, the growth of the trade imbalance in favor of Japan, which constituted in the period 1976-1982 some R7,159,000,000 or more than 90 percent of the sum total of the USSR's trade deficit with all the industrially developed capitalist countries (pp 63-64). The question of the trade imbalance, the book emphasizes, should be solved not through a reduction in Soviet purchases but on the paths of a further expansion of trade and its balance in the long term, for which are sufficiently broad opportunities. This problem may be solved by means of the Japanese side's strict fulfillment of the commitments it has assumed in respect of the acceptance of compensatory products (coal, gas and so forth) per current agreements (p 65).

The monograph pays great attention to the question of large-scale, long-term plans of the two countries' economic cooperation--a comparatively new, but important component of their economic relations. In the 1980's, the work observes, work has been impeded here owing to the obstacles created by the Japanese Government, which made the decision not to extend credit for new plans of economic cooperation with the USSR. Such a short-sighted policy has led to a reduction in such an important item of Japanese exports as supplies of complete-set equipment. Japanese firms have lost profitable Soviet orders, for the supply of a mill for the production of dynamo steel (approximately \$350 million), a polyester fiber plant (approximately \$200 million) and so forth included.

Of course, it is difficult in a single book to reflect the entire diversity of Soviet-Japanese economic relations. But some essential aspects thereof proved beyond the framework of the study, unfortunately. Thus trade with the small and medium-sized Japanese firms merits more detailed analysis, we believe. The significance of this trade is far in excess of its share of the total trade turnover of the USSR and Japan (15 percent). The work could only have benefited if when illustrating questions of scientific cooperation it had also examined the activity of the Japanese Association of Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, which plays an important part in scientific exchange, organizing various symposia, exhibitions and so forth. The monograph practically leaves untouched questions of Soviet-Japanese relations and cooperation in the air service sphere. Yet there is much that is interesting and instructive here.

As a whole, the reviewed work is undoubtedly useful and timely. While objectively indicating the problems and difficulties in the two countries' economic relations it at the same time contributes to the search for ways of overcoming them on a truly mutually profitable basis. The book is permeated by the thought that there are prospects for Soviet-Japanese economic relations and that it is only necessary to make correct use of the available possibilities.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

3850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

INDEX OF ARTICLES FOR 1985

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 85 (signed to press 14 Nov 85) pp 149-157

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

Nos

Information Bulletin on CPSU Central Committee Plenum

Speech of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central
Committee, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 11 March 1985

Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and
USSR Council of Ministers to the Communist Party and the Soviet People 4

APPROACHING THE 27TH CPSU CONGRESS

"Leninist Strategy of Building Communism and Strengthening Peace".....	12
L. Abalkin, "Lenin's Theory of Imperialism in the Light of Current Realities" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	5
"Combat Program of the Party's Activity".....	7
A. Dynkin, "Economic Problems of Scientific-Technical Progress in the Capitalist Countries".....	7
V. Zagladin, "Leninism and the Contemporary Era".....	1
L. Zevin, "The CEMA Countries' Economic Cooperation With the Developing States--Inventions and Reality".....	7
A. Lebedev, "Imperatives of Helsinki (10th Anniversary of the All-European Conference)".....	8
V. Petrovskiy, "Arterial Path Toward a Secure World".....	6
I. Frolov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, "The Great October and the Fate of World Civilization".....	11
A. Yakovlev, "International Significance of the Warsaw Pact".....	7
V. Babak, B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, Yu. Krashenninikov, V. Rasnitsyn, N. Streltsova, "Current Problems of World Politics" (International Roundup).....	7, 10

FORTYETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT VICTORY

A. Babin, "Triumph of Soviet Military-Strategic Thought".....	5
V. Bunin, "The Smashing of Japanese Militarism and Lessons of the Present Day".....	10
Appeal to Scientists of the Whole World in Connection With the 40th Anniversary of the Victory Over Fascism.....	5
A. Orlov, "Sources of Our Victory and Bourgeois Historiography".....	1
"A Victory Which Saved Civilization".....	5
A. Roschchin, "The Lessons of Yalta and the Present Day".....	4
A. Svetlov, "The Warsaw Pact in the Service of Peace and Security".....	5
A. Skrylnik, "The Lenin Party--Organizer and Inspiration of the Great Victory".....	5
Academician S. Tikhvinskiy, "Potsdam: Contours of the Postwar World"...	8
V. Avakov, "Relevance of the Lessons of the Past" (40th Anniversary of the Great Victory).....	3
"Forty Years of the Great Victory" (Scientific Life).....	7
Ye. Yegorova, "The Great Patriotic War: Diplomatic Front" (Review of Book by V.Ya. Sipols, "En Route to the Great Victory. Soviet Diplomacy 1941-1945").....	5
V. Samoylenko, "The Party in the War Years" (Review of the Book "At the Head of the Defense of the Soviet Motherland: Outline of the CPSU's Activity in the Great Patriotic War," second, supplemented edition).....	5

MATERIAL TO ASSIST THOSE STUDYING IN THE POLITICAL TRAINING SYSTEM

"Leninist Strategy of Building Communism and Strengthening Peace".....	12
L. Abalkin, "Lenin's Theory of Imperialism in the Light of Current Realities (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	5
A. Babin, "Triumph of Soviet Military-Strategic Thought".....	5
"Combat Program of the Party's Activity".....	7
Ye. Velikhov, A. Kokoshin, "Nuclear Weapons and Dilemmas of International Security".....	4
A. Grabovskiy, "Common Course Toward a Single Goal" (Results of the 40th Meeting of the CEMA Session).....	9
Yu. Denisov, "International Significance of Soviet-Finnish Cooperation".....	2
V. Zagladin, "Leninism and the Contemporary Era".....	1
V. Zagladin, "First People's Revolution of the Era of Imperialism".....	10
I. Ivanov, "The TNC and Contradictions Between Labor and Capital".....	10
A. Kodachenko, "Problems of the Economic Cooperation and Integration of the Developing Countries".....	11
"A Victory Which Saved Civilization".....	5
A. Skrylnik, "The Lenin Party--Organizer and Inspiration of the Great Victory".....	5
Yu. Stolyarov, A. Shmyrev, "The Pacific in the Strategy of Imperialism".....	6

D. Tomashevskiy, V. Lukov, "The Interests of Mankind and World Politics".....	4
Yu. Tomilin, "International Security and Ways of Increasing the Efficiency of the United Nations".....	11
G. Uranov, "The United States Assaults UNESCO".....	12
P. Fedoseyev, "The Present-Day Antiwar Movement and Its Development Prospects".....	2
I. Frolov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, "The Great October and the Fate of World Civilization".....	11
A. Yakovlev, "Sources of the Threat and Public Opinion".....	3
V. Babak, B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, Yu. Krasheninnikov, V. Nikiforov, K. Nikolayev, T. Panova, V. Rasnitsyn, M. Strezhneva, N. Streltsova, Yu. Fedorov, "Current Problem of World Politics" (International Roundup)	1, 4, 7, 10
"The Capitalist Economy in 1984" (Survey of Business Conditions).....	3
"Latin America: Contradictions of the New Stage" (MEMO Roundtable).....	5, 8

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND FOREIGN POLICY

I. Vanin, V. Golubkov, "The UN Law of the Sea Convention--Time of Important Decisions".....	1
I. Vanin, Yu. Golubkov, "Concern of the International Law of the Sea Authority".....	9
A. Vasilyev, "Program of Aggression in Space".....	11
Ye. Velikhov, A. Kokoshin, "Nuclear Weapons and Dilemmas of International Security".....	4
L. Voronkov, "Small West European Countries in World Politics".....	11
S. Morgachev, "Questions of Security in North Europe and Sweden's Policy".....	8
Yu. Tomilin, "Averting the Nuclear Danger--Priority Task".....	3
A. Yakovlev, "Sources of the Threat and Public Opinion".....	3
V. Amirov, Yu. Belokon, "Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific" (Our Commentary).....	12
V. Babak, B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, Yu. Krasheninnikov, V. Nikiforov, K. Nikolayev, T. Panova, V. Rasnitsyn, M. Strezhneva, N. Streltsova, Yu. Fedorov, "Current Problems of World Politics" (International Roundup).....	1, 4, 7, 10
E. Grebenshchikov, "ANZUS--Centrifugal Trends?" (Our Commentary).....	1
A. Kudryavtsev, "France and the American 'Star Wars' Program" (Our Correspondent Abroad).....	10
I. Lebedev, "Indian Ocean--Zone of Peace or Confrontation?" (Our Commentary).....	8
V. Lukov, "Constructive Dialogue" (Results of the 13th International Political Science Association Congress)(Our Commentary).....	12
The Leninist Policy of Peace and Peaceful Coexistence in Soviet Foreign Policy	
"Leninist Strategy of Building Communism and Strengthening Peace".....	12

Meeting of the Scientific Council for Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament.....	6
Yu. Komissarov, "Policy of Friendship, Trust and Cooperation" (85th Birthday of U.K. Kekkonen).....	9
V. Kravtsov, "USSR-France: New Stage of East-West Dialogue".....	12
A. Lebedev, "Imperatives of Helsinki (10th Anniversary of the All-European Conference)".....	8
V. Petrovskiy, "Arterial Path Toward a Safe World".....	6
A. Svetlov, "The Warsaw Pact in the Service of Peace and Security".....	5
D. Tomashevskiy, V. Lukov, "Interests of Mankind and World Politics".....	4
Yu. Tomilin, "International Security and Ways of Increasing the Efficiency of the United Nations".....	11
A. Yakovlev, "International Significance of the Warsaw Pact".....	7
 The Foreign Policy and Foreign Economic Expansion of Imperialism	
S. Blagovolin, "Expansion of the Military-Industrial Complexes in the International Arena".....	10
V. Bunin, "The Smashing of Japanese Militarism and Lessons of the Present Day".....	10
A. Vasilyev, "Program of Aggression in Space".....	11
N. Vladimirov, "Japan's Policy in the Asia-Pacific Region: Cautionary Features".....	9
G. Vorontsov, "The United States, NATO and the Conventional Arms Race".....	5
A. Nikonov, R. Faramazyan, "The Military-Industrial Complex in the System of State-Monopoly Capitalism".....	7
Yu. Stolyarov, A. Shmyrev, "The Pacific in the Strategy of Imperialism".....	6
Yu. Tomilin, "Averting the Nuclear Danger--Priority Task".....	3
G. Uranov, "The United States Assaults UNESCO".....	12
G. Khozin, "Conquest of Space and Social Consciousness in the United States".....	3
A. Yakovlev, "Sources of the Threat and Public Opinion".....	3
V. Bashkin, "The Israeli Special Services--Implement of Aggression and Terror" (Surveys, Information).....	1
V. Ustinov, "New Step Toward the Creation of Binary Weapons" (Our Commentary).....	11
 The Present-Day Antiwar and Democratic Movements	
Meeting of the Scientific Council for Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament.....	6
Ye. Silin, "The Antiwar Movement at the Current Stage".....	6
P. Fedoseyev, "The Present-Day Antiwar Movement and Its Development Prospects".....	2
V. Skorokhodov, A. Trukhan, "The Ideological Struggle and the Younger Generation in the Western World" (Capitalism and Youth).....	11

ECONOMICS OF SOCIALISM

L. Abayeva, L. Tsedilin, "Fraternal Alliance of the USSR and the GDR"....	5
B. Gorizontov, "Transport and Socialist Economic Integration" (Experience of Socialist Integration).....	12
A. Grabovskiy, "Common Course Toward a Single Goal" (Results of the 40th Meeting of the CEMA Session).....	9
L. Yefimov, "Forty Years of the Korean People's Freedom and Struggle" (Glorious Anniversaries).....	10
M. Isayev, "Socialist Vietnam--40 Years of Struggle and Building" (Glorious Anniversaries).....	9
M. Isayev, "The Indochina Countries: Along the Path of Social Progress".....	4
A. Nikolskiy, "Most Important Basis of Socialist Economic Integration"...	3
F. Tckhin, "Hungary on the Path of Socialist Creation" (Glorious Anniversaries).....	5
A. Yanin, "Forty Years of People's Czechoslovakia" (Glorious Anniversaries).....	5
A. Bykov, "International Technology Exchange and World-Economic Relations" (Surveys, Information).....	6
S. Tsukanov, "The USSR's Assistance to the Developing Countries in the Creation of Scientific-Technical Potential" (Surveys, Information).....	12

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Yu. Denisov, "International Significance of Soviet-Finnish Cooperation"...	2
L. Zevin, "The CEMA Countries' Economic Cooperation With the Developing States--Intentions and Reality".....	7
V. Presnyakov, "Economic Aspects of the Cooperation of the USSR and France" (Surveys, Information).....	1
M. Yasovskaya, "Firm Foundation of Soviet-Austrian Cooperation" (Surveys, Information).....	6

CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Yu. Adzhubey, "The TNC and the Scientific-Technical Potential of the Capitalist States".....	11
I. Basova, L. Volodin, S. Sokolskiy, V. Shenayev, "The FRG: Dangerous Trends".....	1
N. Volkov, N. Shmelev, "Structural Changes in the Economy of Capitalism".....	8
N. Gauzner, "Theory of the 'Information Society' and Realities of Capitalism".....	10
L. Gromov, Ye. Chetyrkin, "Formation of the Industrial-Information Complex in the Capitalist Countries".....	6
B. Dobrovinskiy, "Scientific-Technical Progress and Formation of the Capitalist Knowhow Market" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	12

A. Dynkin, "Economic Problems of Scientific-Technical Progress in the Capitalist Countries".....	7
I. Ivanov, "The TNC and Contradictions Between Labor and Capital".....	10
O. Kazakova, "Structural Problems of the Economy of the Scandinavian Countries".....	2
"The Capitalist Economy in 1984" (Survey of Business Conditions).....	3
N. Kovalskiy, "Behind the Scenes of Vatican Economics".....	1
Yu. Kurenkov, A. Konoplyanik, "Dynamics of Production Costs, Prices and Profitability in the World Oil Industry".....	2
V. Lyubimova, "Wages Under the Conditions of the Growth of the Instability of the Capitalist Economy".....	7
V. Lyubimova, Z. Pashetkina, "Problems of Female Labor in the Developed Capitalist Countries".....	12
O. Oskolkova, "'Zero' Population Growth and Its Consequences for Western Countries".....	8
S. Solodovnikov, "The Developing Countries and the International Debt Crisis".....	3
I. Sheyman, "Scientific-Technical Progress and New Forms of Economic Servicing".....	9
V. Shenayev, "Singularities of State-Monopoly Capitalism in West Europe".....	9
Yu. Baturin, "Greenland's Political Silence Recedes Into the Past" (MEMO Atlas).....	6
M. Belyayev, "Japanese Capital in Britain" (Surveys, Information).....	7
A. Bykov, "International Technology Exchange and World-Economic Relations" (Surveys, Information).....	6
N. Vishnevskaya, "Unemployment in West Europe--Gloomy Forecasts" (We Answer Readers' Questions).....	12
I. Grigulevich, "Briefly Concerning Vatican Policy" (Our Commentary).....	10
B. Dubson, "The Younger Generation in the Labor Market" (Capitalism and Youth).....	9
"West Europe in the Economy and Policy of Imperialism" (International Conference).....	11
L. Kapranova, "Chronic Ailments of the American Cities" (Surveys, Information).....	12
A. Kvasov, "The Bronfman Canadian Financial Group" (Portrait of a Monopoly).....	2
T. Kozyreva, "Currency Aspects of the EEC's Agrarian Integration" (Surveys, Information).....	12
"Crisis of State-Monopoly Regulation and Its Reflection in Bourgeois Political Economy" (International Symposium).....	2, 4
A. Kudryavtsev, "Exacerbation of Socioeconomic Contradictions in France" (Our Correspondent Abroad).....	7
Ye. Lebedeva, P. Nedotko, "United States: Venture Capital and the Small-Scale Research Business" (Surveys, Information).....	5
Yu. Levin, "Interstate Associations of Raw Material Exporters and Market Regulation" (Surveys, Information).....	3
N. Maslov, "Reproduction of Fixed Capital in Japan (1970's-Start of 1980's)" (Surveys, Information).....	11

A. Rogovitskiy, "Eurocurrencies in Capitalism's Credit-Monetary System" (Surveys, Information).....	9
N. Smorodinskaya, "Scientific-Technical Progress and the Japanese Banks" (Surveys, Information).....	8
T. Filimonova, "Enlargement of the EEC" (Our Commentary).....	4
A. Khlystov, "United States-Japan-West Europe: on New Fronts of the 'Electronic War'" (Surveys, Information).....	4
Ye. Shalayeva (Leningrad), "Royal Dutch Shell" (Portrait of a Monopoly).....	11
V. Shumilin, "The FRG in the International Migration of Capital" (Surveys, Information).....	10
Yu. Yudanov, "Problem of the FRG's 'Technological Backwardness'", Articles One and Two (Our Correspondent Abroad).....	5, 6
Yu. Yudanov, "'Technology Pools'" (Our Correspondent Abroad).....	11
Yu. Yudanov, "Vain Search for a Joint Economic Strategy (the Bonn 'Summit')" (Our Correspondent Abroad).....	9
M. Yasovskaya, "Austria's State Industry" (Surveys, Information).....	2

DISCUSSION

E. Pletnev, "For a Political-Economic Approach to the Worldwide Economy Category".....	7
Ye. Punin, "What Is the Basis of the Price of a Specific Commodity: Cost or Use Value?" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	1
A. Shapiro, "Once More on the Question of the Theory of the Worldwide Economy".....	3
A. Kandalintsev, V. Kandalintsev, "On the Question of the Methodology of the Study of the Price of a Specific Commodity".....	8
V. Slavinskiy, "International Production Relations: Secondary, Derived, Transferred?".....	11

THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. PLACE IN WORLD ECONOMY AND POLICY. NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

Yu. Alimov, "Connection of Time and Events (30th Anniversary of the Bandung Conference)".....	6
V. Vasilyev, "The 'New Industrial Countries' in the International Capitalist Division of Labor".....	2
V. Yevgenyev, "Along the Path of Independent Development and Social Progress (30th Anniversary of the Algerian Revolution)".....	1
L. Zevin, "The CEMA Countries' Economic Cooperation With the Developing States--Inventions and Reality".....	7
A. Kodachenko, "Problems of the Economic Cooperation and Integration of the Developing Countries".....	11
V. Korochantsev, "The Democratic Republic of Madagascar--Along the Path of Social Progress".....	8

V. Mikhalev, "Industrial Development and Economic Shifts in the ASEAN Countries".....	7
Yu. Osipov, Yu. Cherkasov, "Socioeconomic Problems and Development Prospects of Africa".....	8
N. Simoniya, "Dialectics of Interrelations" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	3
S. Solodovnikov, "The Developing Countries and the International Debt Crisis".....	3
B. Starostin, "Formation of Sociological Thought in the Developing Countries".....	4
O. Ulrikh, "Role of the State in Countering Neocolonial Exploitation"....	12
N. Shmelev, "Urgent Problems and Development Strategy of the Emergent Countries" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	3
V. Shubin, "The Apartheid Regime--Parameters of the Crisis".....	12
A. Elyanov, "The Emergent Countries--Interaction of Internal and External Development Factors" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	10
O. Vorkunov (deceased), "Problems of the Formation and Use of Labor Resources in the Developing Countries" (Surveys, Information).....	4
A. Georgiyev, "Egypt's Social-Political Development--Problems and Trends" (Sociologists' Opinion).....	1
I. Zorina, "Mexico, 1985" (Sociologist's Opinion).....	11
"Latin America: Contradictions of the New Stage" (MEMO Roundtable).....5,	8
Yu. Levin, "International Raw Material Exporters and Market Regulation" (Surveys, Information).....	3
B. Rubtsov, "Oceania" (MEMO Atlas).....	8
K. Fedotov, "The Arab Countries' Specialized Funds" (We Answer Readers' Questions).....	7
S. Tsukanov, "The USSR's Assistance to the Developing Countries in the Creation of Scientific-Technical Potential" (Surveys, Information).....	12

DOMESTIC POLITICAL LIFE ABROAD

I. Gorodetskaya, "Organizations of Defenders of the Environment in Great Britain".....	6
Ye. Dmitriyev, "Israel: What Next?" (Our Commentary).....	10
I. Zorina, "Mexico, 1985" (Sociologist's Opinion).....	11
L. Istyagin, "Fascism--Laid Low and Reviving" (History and Current Affairs).....	5
"U.S. Election Results" (Exchange of Opinions).....	3
I. Semenenko, "The Ecology Movement in Italy: In the Search for a New 'Quality of Life'".....	6
V. Skorokhodov, "The Ecologists' Movement in France".....	6
V. Skorokhodov, A. Trukhan, "The Ideological Struggle and the Younger Generation in the Western World" (Capitalism and Youth).....	11
"The Ecology Movement in West Europe".....	6

CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES

K. Valtukh (Novosibirsk), "The Law of Value Operates".....	6
K. Gadzhiyev, "Certain Trends in Contemporary Bourgeois Ideology".....	9
N. Gauzner, "Theory of the 'Information Society' and the Realities of Capitalism".....	10
V. Zarin, "Bourgeois Economists on Problems of the Reorganization of the World Capitalist Economy".....	12
G. Ikonnikova, "Optimistic Wave of the Sociology of 'Technological Determinism'" (Sociologist's Opinion).....	2
V. Kuznetsov, "French Economic Thought of the 1970's-1980's".....	9
Ya. Murakami, "Critique of Neoliberalist Economic Policy".....	2
B. Starostin, "Formation of Sociological Thought in the Developing Countries".....	4
Ya. Pevzner, "The Spuriousness of Neoliberalism" (Platform of the Economist and International Affairs Expert).....	2
"Crisis of State-Monopoly Regulation and Its Reflection in Bourgeois Political Economy" (International Symposium).....	2, 4
A. Rogovitskiy, "The Eurocurrencies in Capitalism's Credit- Monetary System" (Surveys, Information).....	9

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

International Conference of Scientists of the Socialist Countries.....	2
Appeal to Scientists of the Whole World in Connection With the 40th Anniversary of the Victory Over Fascism.....	5
Appeal of Scholars of the Socialist Countries Studying Problems of Peace and Disarmament..	2
G. Anulova, A. Medvedev, I. Doronin, "Topical Problems of International Currency-Credit Relations".....	8
A. Akhtamzyan, "Fortieth Anniversary of the UN Charter".....	9
A. Bogomolov, "International Seminar in Tashkent".....	10
"West Europe in the Economy and Policy of Imperialism" (International Conference).....	11
T. Klemina, M. Petrov, "Readers' Conference in Leningrad".....	2
"Crisis of State-Monopoly Regulation and Its Reflection in Bourgeois Political Economy" (International Symposium).....	2, 4
Yu. Levin, "Pacific Seminar in Nakhodka".....	1
Session in the IMEMO in Remembrance of V.L. Tyagunenko.....	6
"Forty Years of the Great Victory".....	7

JUBILEE DATES

Eightieth Birthday of A.M. Rumyantsev.....	3
Yu. Komissarov, "Policy of Friendship, Trust and Cooperation" (Eighty-fifth Birthday of U.K. Kekkonen).....	9
Birthday of Prof V.V. Zubchaninov.....	7

BOOKS, AUTHORS (Book Reviews)

V. Abarenkov, "Ways to Strengthen Peace" (B.P. Krasulin, "Political Guarantees of Removal of the Nuclear Threat").....	12
V. Avakov, "Behind the Camp David Facade" (Ye.M. Primakov, "Story of a Conspiracy (U.S. Near East Policy in the 1970's-Start of the 1980's)").....	6
I. Aleshina, "Interdisciplinary Analysis: Efficiency and Difficulties" ("The Developing Countries. Basic Problems of Economic and Social Geography").....	6
L. Bagramov, "Present-Day Monopoly Capitalism" ("Australia and Canada").....	12
I. Bazileva, "The United Nations and Washington's Imperial Ambitions" ("The United States, United Nations and the Control of World Problems").....	12
V. Baranovskiy, "Evolution of the West European 'Power Center'" ("West Europe: Political and Military Integration").....	8
Yu. Belokon, "Problems of Computerization in the Developing Countries" ((Zh. Konki Ber-Gabel)), "Provision of the Third World With Information and International Cooperation").....	7
M. Belyayev, "The Earth's Resources: Two Views of the Future" ("The Abundant Planet: Reply to 'The World in the Year 2000'").....	9
O. Borisova, "The Capitalist Currency-Finance Mechanism" ((E. Rode)), "Banks, Stock Exchanges and Currencies Under the Conditions of Present-Day Capitalism").....	10
Yu. Bor' o, "Important Direction of the Class Struggle" (L.I. Solovyeva, "Problems of Social Security in the EEC Countries").....	3
Ye. Bragina, "Social Problems of the Emergent States" (M. Hardiman and G. Midgely, "Social Limits of Development. Social Policy and Planning in the Third World").....	11
L. Vadimov, "USSR and the United States: Comparison of Approaches to the Disarmament Problem" (Daniel Frey, "Disarmament: the Role of Assumptions and Perceptions").....	10
V. Valentinov, "Belated Debate" ("Nuclear Weapons in Europe").....	6
V. Varnavskiy, "Structural Singularities of the FRG Economy" ("Increased Need for the Control of Structural Shifts: Analysis of the Structural Development of the West German Economy").....	9
E. Vasilevskiy, "Small Research Firms and Scientific-Technical Progress" (Ye.A. Lebedeva, P.A. Nedotko, "Introduction of Inventions in U.S. Industry ((Role of Small-Scale Research Business)))").....	9
I. Vasilyeva, "Economic Aspects of the Recreational Spheres" (O.V. Terekhova, "The Leisure Industry in the United States").....	6
K. Voronov, "Concern for the Future" (D. Adler, "The European Theater. Book on Missiles and the New Nuclear Debate").....	7
O. Gamova, "Futile Prescriptions" (D. Simpson, "Political Economy of Growth. Classical Political Economy and the Modern World").....	3
V. Davydov, "Urgent Present-Day Problem" ("International Organizations and Disarmament. International Mechanism for the Study of Questions of Arms Limitation and Disarmament").....	11

V. Davydov, "An American Expert on the Causes of 'Nuclear Proliferation'" (S.M. Meyer, "Dynamics of Nuclear Proliferation").....	8
V. Davydov, "Banning Chemical Weapons" (S. Murphy, E. Hay and S. Rose, "Without Fire and Smoke. Threat of Chemical and Biological Weapons").....	3
V. Dyakin, "Through the Prism of the Military Budget" (Yu. V. Katasonov, "United States: Military Policy and Budget").....	10
Ye. Yegorova, "The Great Patriotic: Diplomatic Front" (V.Ya. Sipols, "En Route to the Great Victory. Soviet Diplomacy 1941-1945").....	5
Yu. Yelyutin, "Difficult Path Toward Genuine Independence" (L.L. Klochkovskiy, "Latin America in the System of World Economic Relations").....	1
V. Yemelyanov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, "Topical Work" ("Disastrous Consequences of Nuclear War ((Socioeconomic Aspects)))").....	12
I. Yermachenkov, "The 'Big Lie' Mechanism" ("Our Daily Disinformation. How We Are Led Astray by the Mass Information Organs").....	10
S. Zatsepilov, I. Tyulin, "Myths and Reality" ("The Soviet Union and the Third World: Envelopment Strategy").....	6
K. Zuyeva, D. Tomashevskiy, "'Little Europe' and International Relations" (V. Kniajinski, "West European Integration: Policy and International Relations").....	11
N. Ivanov, "The Arms Race and the People's Masses" ("Struggle for Relaxation of International Tension and Socioeconomic Problems of Capitalism").....	4
L. Istyagin, "Invincibility of the Idea of Peace" (L. Knerr, "History of the Antiwar Movement in the FRG").....	2
I. Karpov, A. Mashev, "Foreign Economic Strategy of the Developing Countries" (V.N. Banerjee, "From Cancun to New Delhi. South-South Cooperation").....	3
A. Keyerna, "Great Britain: Gloomy Science Prospects" ("Policy in the Science Sphere in the United Kingdom. Critical Survey of Policy in the Sphere of Public-Funded Research").....	2
A. Kireyev, "Material Basis of Peaceful Coexistence" ("East-West Relations in the Mid-1980's: In Search of a New Balance").....	6
I. Korolev, "Important Factor of Economic Development" (V.V. Shmelev, "Economic Groupings of the Developing Countries. Economic-Statistical Handbook").....	7
S. Kotsuba, "For Mutually Profitable Cooperation" ((Kaddzuo Ogava)), "Foreign Trade: Soviet Union-Japan").....	4
V. Kudrov, "Economic Efficiency Under the Conditions of Capitalism" ("Present-Day Capitalism: Accumulation and Labor Productivity").....	11
V. Kuznetsov, "French Scientist on the Norm of Surplus Value" J.-C. Delauney, "Wage Labor and Surplus Value in France Since the End of the 19th Century").....	8

Yu. Kuznetsov, "For Mutual Profit and Good-Neighborliness" ("USSR-Japan: Problems of Trade-Economic Relations").....	12
A. Kulikov, "Crisis of Capitalist Apologetics" ("Critique of Bourgeois Theories of State-Monopoly Capitalism. Problems of the 'Mixed Economy'").....	5
A. Kulikov, "Convincing Critique of the Economic Futurology of Capitalism" (A.I. Shapiro, "Current Problems and Prospects of the World Capitalist Economy. Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Concepts").....	7
A. Kunitsyn, "Facts Against Fabrications" (A.S. Drabkin, "'Project of the Century': Facts and Fabrications").....	9
V. Leybin, "Technocratism and the Struggle of Ideas" (E.V. Demenchonok, "Contemporary Technocratic Ideology in the United States").....	8
N. Liventsev, "The West's Trade Policy Against the Developing Countries" (S.A. Otreshko, "Evolution of Imperialism's Trade Strategy and the Developing Countries").....	9
A. Likhotal, "Great Britain in European Politics" (G.V. Kolosov, "Britain's Military-Political Course in Europe").....	9
A. Likhotal, "Washington Is To Blame" (Michael Sheehan, "The Arms Race").....	2
V. Lukin, "The Noncapitalist Path--Achievements and Difficulties" (V.F. Li, "Social Revolution and Power in the Oriental Countries").....	11
I. Makarov, V. Rodionov, "Dead-End Strategy" (Davis Buchan, "The West's Security and Economic Strategy Toward the East").....	9
N. Makasheva, "Old Principles-'New' Trends" (R.B. Mackenzie, "Limits of Economic Science. Procedural Outline").....	5
L. Maksimova, "United States: Impasse of Economic Regulation" ("Economic Alternatives of 1984").....	4
Yu. Melnikov, "The 'Intelligence Community' in the U.S. Government Structure" (F.M. Sergeyev, "Secret Weapon of Aggression ((U.S. Subversive Activity Against the USSR))").....	10
K. Mikulskiy, "Prospects of Economic Interaction" (N.V. Borokh, V.S. Glagolev, "Strategic Direction of Cooperation. International Specialization and Cooperation of Production of the CEMA Countries").....	2
A. Naumenkov, "The Conservatives' Monetarist Policy" (W. Keegan, "M. Thatcher's Economic Experiment").....	11
L. Nochevkina, L. Presnyakova, "The Scientific-Technical Revolution and the World Economy" (Yu.S. Shiryayev, "The World Economy: New Technological and Sociopolitical Development Factors").....	11
E. Obminskiy, "Responsible for the Fate of the Planet" (Anat. Gromyko, Vl. Lomeyko, "New Thinking for the Nuclear Age").....	3
Yu. Oleshchuk, "Against Ideological Sabotage" (Vladimir Artemov, "The Truth About Untruth. Critical Outline of Contemporary Imperialist Anti-Soviet Propaganda").....	10
Yu. Oleshchuk, "United States--Panorama of Social Disasters" (E. Stuart, "Social Problems of Modern America").....	5
V. Pankov, "State-Monopoly Capitalism--Adaptation Strategy and Its Limits" (A.A. Demin, "State-Monopoly Capitalism: Problems, Trends, Contradictions. An Outline").....	5

V. Petrovskiy, "Interconnection of Economics and Politics" (Yu.M. Khilchevskiy, A.K. Subbotin, "World Economic Development: Potential for Cooperation").....	1
O. Pleshov, "Pakistan in the International Arena" (V.N. Moskalenko, "Pakistan's Foreign Policy ((Formation and Main Stages of Revolution)))").....	7
A. Poletayev, "Economic Analysis--Possibilities of Modeling" (Yu.A. Chizhov, "Dynamics of the Modern Capitalist Economy").....	10
V. Popov, "Why Hunger Exists in the World" (L.A. Bagramov, "Present-Day Capitalism and the Food Problem").....	9
A. Portnyagin, "Military Supplies--Threat to Peace" (A.I. Utkin, "United States and West Europe: Arms Trade ((International Policy Aspect)))").....	6
B. Pugachev, "Objective Regularity of the Socialist World" ("Economic Rapprochement of the Socialist Community Countries. Theoretical-Methodological Problems").....	4
V. Samoylenko, "The Party in the War Years" ("At the Head of Defense of the Soviet Motherland: Outline of the CPSU's Activity in the Great Patriotic War". Second, supplemented, edition).....	5
L. Serebryakova, "Credit Market 'Supermarkets'" (E. Reed, R. Kotter, E. Gill, R. Smith, "The Commercial Banks").....	2
T. Smirnitckaya, "The FRG: Monopolies and the State" (Horst van der Meer, "Political Role and Functions of the FRG's Monopoly Unions")....	3
P. Sokolov, D. Kharitonov, "Militarism and Economics" (R.A. Faramazyan, "The Military Economy of American Imperialism").....	3
G. Sokolnikov, "Singularities of West German State-Monopoly Capitalism" (V.S. Pankov, "The FRG in the Economy of Present-day Capitalism").....	2
A. Sterlin, "Control of Innovations in Capitalist Firms" (G.R. Foxall, "Innovations in the Corporations: Marketing and Strategy")....	4
Academician S. Tikhvinskiy, "Most Important Mission of Science" ("Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Research 1984").....	4
V. Usoskin, "Crisis of the West's Economic Thought" (I.M. Osadchaya, "Conservatism Against Reformism ((Two Trends in Bourgeois Political Economy)))").....	7
I. Faminskiy, "Acute Economic Problem" (S.A. Dalin, "Inflation in the Era of Social Revolutions").....	7
I. Filatochev, "Foreign Investments and the National Economy" (Yu.V. Adzhubey, "Foreign Capital in the Economy of the Capitalist States").....	12
P. Khvoynik, "Anatomy of the Capitalist Economy" (V.V. Rymalov, "Undermining of Age-Old Principles ((Contradictions of Capitalism's World Economic System)))").....	6
Ye. Khesin, "Changes in the United States' Finance-Credit Sphere" (Ye.F. Zhukov, "New Phenomena in the Activity of U.S. Financial-Credit Institutions").....	8
V. Cheprakov, "Present-Day Monopoly Capitalism" ("The Small West European Countries").....	1
A. Chekhutov, "Present and Future of the Oil-Producing Countries" (R.O. Indzhikyan, "OPEC in the World Capitalist Economy").....	2

A. Sharov, "'All the Gold of the World...'" (S.M. Borisov, "Gold in the Economy of Contemporary Capitalism". Second, revised and supplemented, edition).....	8
Yu. Shishkov, "Lost Illusions" (Yu.A. Borko, "Economic Integration and Social Development Under Capitalist Conditions: Bourgeois Theories and the Experience of the European Community").....	9
R. Entov, "Addressed to Economists-International Affairs Experts" (M.A. Menshikova, "English Economic Terms. A Handbook").....	1
S. Yakovleva (Leningrad), "Capitalist Exploitation Today" ("Exploitation of the Working People of the Capitalist Countries Under the Conditions of the Scientific-Technical Revolution").....	2

STATISTICS

N. Vishnevskaya, "Unemployment in the Capitalist Countries (1970-1984)"...	9
Yu. Levin, A. Medvedev, "Certain Trends of International Trade".....	2, 4, 6
V. Perfilyeva, "Female Labor in the Capitalist Countries".....	10, 11
In Remembrance of Aleksandr Vladimirovich Kirsanov.....	5
In Remembrance of Viktor Aronovich Cheprakov.....	8

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850/9869

CSO: 1816/4

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

3 April 86